DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 786	HE 006 803
TITLE	Hearings Before the Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Ninety-Third Congress, Second Session on H.R. 9832 to Eliminate Discrimination Based on Sex with Respect to the Appointment and Admission of Persons to the Service Academies and H.R. 10705, H.R. 11267, H.R. 11268, H.R. 11711, and H.R. 13729 to Insure That Each Admission to the Service Academies Shall Be Made Without Regard to a Candidates Sex, Race, Color, or Religious Beliefs.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Armed Services.
REPORT NO	HASC-94-9
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	304p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 ($2.75)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$15.86 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Discrimination; *Federal Legislation; *Higher Education; *Military Personnel; *Military Schools; Racial Discrimination; Religious Discrimination; Sex Discrimination

ABSTRACT

H.R. 9832 is a bill to eliminate discrimination based on sex with respect to the appointment and admission of persons to the service academies. H.R. 10705, H.R. 11267, H.R. 11268, H.R. 11711, and H.R. 12729 are bills to insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidates sex, race, or religious beliefs. The hearings for these bills were held before the Subcommittee Number 2 of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Ninety-third Congress, Second Session. (Author)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED112786

HE

[H.A.S.C. No. 94-9]

HEARINGS

ON

H.R. 9832

TO ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION BASED ON SEX WITH RESPECT TO THE APPOINTMENT AND ADMISSION OF PERSONS TO THE SERVICE ACADEMIES

AND

H.R. 10705, H.R. 11267, H.R. 11268, H.R. 11711, AND H.R. 13729

TO INSURE THAT EACH ADMISSION TO THE SERVICE ACADEMIES SHALL BE MADE WITHOUT REGARD TO A CANDIDATE'S SEX, RACE, COLOR, OR RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

BEFORE

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

HEARINGS HELD MAY 29; JUNE 4, 5, 12, 18, 19; JULY 16, 18; AUGUST 8, 1974

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
52-646 O WASHINGTON : 1975

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price $2.75

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2

93d Congress

(Military Personnel)

O. C. FISHER, Texas, *Chairman*

LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Michigan
DAN DANIEL, Virginia
G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, Mississippi
WILLIAM J. RANDALL, Missouri
CHARLES H. WILSON, California

WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, Alabama
WALTER E. POWELL, Ohio
DAVID C. TREEN, Louisiana
MARJORIE S. HOLT, Maryland
ELWOOD H. HILLIS, Indiana

WILLIAM H. HOGAN, Jr., *Counsel*

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 29, 1974: Page

H.R. 9832 2
H.R. 10705 5
H.R. 11267 8
H.R. 11268 11
H.R. 11711 14
H.R. 13729 17
Department of Defense views on H.R. 10705, correspondence from W. P. Clements, Deputy Secretary of Defense 20
Schroeder, Hon. Patricia, Representative from Colorado 21
Stratton, Hon. Samuel S., Representative from New York 35

Tuesday, June 4, 1974:

du Pont, Hon. Pierre S., Representative from Delaware 51
Fascell, Hon. Dante B., Representative from Florida 56
Frenzel, Hon. Bill, Representative from Minnesota 59

Wednesday, June 5, 1974:

Hoffmann, Hon. Martin R., General Counsel, Department of Defense 65
Benade, Lt. Gen. Leo C., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Personnel 72

Wednesday, June 12, 1974:

Middendorf, Hon. J. William, II, Secretary of the Navy 89
Mack, Vice Adm. William P., Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy 90
Bagley, Vice Adm. David, Chief of Naval Operations 106
Bagley, Vice Adm. Worth, Chief of Naval Operations 128

Tuesday, June 18, 1974:

McLucas, Hon. John L., Secretary of the Air Force 131
Brown, Gen. George S., Chief of Staff of the Air Force 133
Clark, Lt. Gen. A. P., Superintendent, U.S. Air Force Academy 134

Wednesday, June 19, 1974:

Callaway, Hon. Howard H., Secretary of the Army 160
  Address of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, U.S. Military Academy, May 12, 1962 162
  Analysis of Federal laws regarding women in combat roles and admission to West Point 180
Weyand, Gen. Fred C., Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army 166
Knowlton, Lt. Gen. William A., Superintendent, U.S. Military Academy 168
  Comparison of West Point and ROTC programs 194
Kirby, Lt. Michael, West Point graduate, class of 1974 201
Townes, Cadet Captain Stephen, first-classman, West Point Military Academy 202

Tuesday, July 16, 1974:

Dondy, Ms. Virginia M., Center for Women Policy Studies 211
Gates, Ms. Margaret, Center for Women Policy Studies 215
Martin, Thomas, Center for Women Policy Studies 216
Ellefson-Brooks, Ms. Glenn, Director, Veterans Affairs, Women's Lobby, Inc 224
Burris, Ms. Carol, President, Women's Lobby, Inc 224
King, Lt. Col. Grace M., U.S. Army Reserve 226
Wells, Miss Susan 237

Thursday, July 18, 1974:

Fraser, Hon. Donald M., Representative from Minnesota 241
Stark, Hon. Fortney H., Representative from California 248
Cochran, Miss Jacqueline 254
Edwards, Hon. Don, Representative from California 264

Thursday, July 18, 1974—Continued

Page
Rangel, Hon. Charles B., Representative from New York 265
Won Pat, Hon. Antonio B., Delegate from the Territory of Puerto Rico 266
Dellums, Hon. Ronald V., Representative from California 267
Burke, Hon. Yvonne B., Representative from California 267
Hansen, Hon. Julia Butler, Representative from Washington 268
Hathaway, Hon. William D., Senator from Maine 269
Hogan, Hon. Lawrence J., Representative from Maryland 269
Biester, Hon. Edward G., Representative from Pennsylvania 270
Holtzman, Hon. Elizabeth, Representative from New York 272
Jordan, Hon. Barbara, Representative from Texas 273
Dent, Hon. John H., Representative from Pennsylvania 274
Gale, Mary Ellen, counsel, American Civil Liberties Union 283

Thursday, August 8, 1974:

Van Doren, A. Reading, Jr., General Counsel, Maritime Administration 287
Jenkins, Comdr. Emmanuel L., Director of Admissions, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy 288

[H.A.S.C. No. 94-9]

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL HEARINGS ON H.R. 9832 TO ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION BASED ON SEX WITH RESPECT TO THE APPOINTMENT AND ADMISSION OF PERSONS TO THE SERVICE ACADEMIES; H.R. 10705, H.R. 11267, H.R. 11268, H.R. 11711, AND H.R. 13729, TO INSURE THAT EACH ADMISSION TO THE SERVICE ACADEMIES SHALL BE MADE WITHOUT REGARD TO A CANDIDATE'S SEX, RACE, COLOR, OR RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

House of Representatives,
Committee on Armed Services,
Subcommittee No. 2,
Washington, D.C., Wednesday, May 29, 1974.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m. in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. O. C. Fisher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. Fisher. The committee will come to order.

This morning we meet to commence hearings on several measures that would admit qualified applicants to the service academies regardless of sex, race, color, or religious beliefs.

I want to indicate for the record that I announced these hearings in a 1-minute speech on the floor on May 15, 1974, and issued a press release on the same day. In addition, we notified personally each Member who joined in sponsoring legislation on the subject.

We are scheduled to commence receiving testimony today from Members of Congress and in future sessions will hear from representatives of the Department of Defense, the service academies, and others. We welcome as witnesses here this morning our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, and we have scheduled hearings next Tuesday, June 4, to hear from other Members of Congress.

We will make the bills and the report a part of the record at this point.

[The bills and report follow:]

93D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9832

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 2, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

---

A BILL

To eliminate discrimination based on sex with respect to the appointment and admission of persons to the service academies.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of chapter 403 of title 10, United States Code (relating to the United States Military Academy), chapter 603 of such title (relating to the United States Naval Academy), and chapter 903 of such title (relating to the United States Air Force Academy), the Secretary of the military department concerned shall take such action as may be necessary and appropriate to insure that female individuals shall be eligible for appointment and ad-

I

mission to the service academy concerned and that the academic and other relevant standards required for the appointment and admission of female individuals shall be the same as those required for the appointment and admission of male individuals.

93D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 10705

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 3, 1973

Mr. DU PONT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

---

A BILL

To insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 403 of title 10 of the United States Code (relating to the Army Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 4346 the following new subsection:

"(e) Admission to the Academy shall be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

I

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 4342, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

(b) Chapter 603 of such title (relating to the Naval Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 6958 the following new subsection:

"(d) Admission to the Academy shall be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 6954, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

(c) Chapter 903 of such title (relating to the Air Force Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 9346 the following new subsection:

"(e) Admission to the Academy shall be made on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and

(c) of section 9342, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 2. Section 182 (a) of title 14 of the United States Code (relating to admission to the Coast Guard Academy) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following new sentence: "All such appointments shall be made without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of the applicants.".

SEC. 3. Section 216 (b) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1126 (b) (1), relating to admission to the Merchant Marine Academy) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "Appointments from each State shall be made" where it appears in the penultimate sentence the following: "without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of candidates";

(2) by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "sons and daughters".

SEC. 4. Section 901 (a) of the Education Amendments of 1972 (86 Stat. 373; 20 U.S.C. 1861 (a), relating to prohibition of sex discrimination and exceptions thereto) is amended by striking out paragraph (4) and redesignating paragraph (5), and any reference thereto, as paragraph (4).

93d CONGRESS
1st Session

H. R. 11267

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

November 6, 1973

Mr. du Pont (for himself, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Bell, Ms. Burke of California, Ms. Chisholm, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Corman, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Dellums, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Eilberg, Mr. Fascell, Ms. Hansen of Washington, Mr. Hogan, Ms. Holtzman, Ms. Jordan, Mr. Keating, Mr. Lent, Mr. Moss, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Roy, Mr. Sarbanes, Ms. Schroeder, and Mr. Seiberling) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

---

A BILL

To insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 403 of title 10 of the United States Code (relating to the Army Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 4346 the following new subsection:

"(e) Admission to the Academy shall be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in this section and

I

without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 4342, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

(b) Chapter 603 of such title (relating to the Naval Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 6958 the following new subsection:

"(d) Admission to the Academy shall be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 6954, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

(c) Chapter 903 of such title (relating to the Air Force Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 9346 the following new subsection:

"(e) Admission to the Academy shall be made on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 9342, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 2. Section 182 (a) of title 14 of the United States Code (relating to admission to the Coast Guard Academy) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following new sentence: "All such appointments shall be made without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of the applicants.".

SEC. 3. Section 216 (b) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1126 (b) (1), relating to admission to the Merchant Marine Academy) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "Appointments from each State shall be made" where it appears in the penultimate sentence the following: "without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of candidates";

(2) by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "sons and daughters".

SEC. 4. Section 901 (a) of the Education Amendments of 1972 (86 Stat. 373; 20 U.S.C. 1861 (a), relating to prohibition of sex discrimination and exceptions thereto) is amended by striking out paragraph (4) and redesignating paragraph (5), and any reference thereto, as paragraph (4).

93D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11268

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOVEMBER 6, 1973

Mr. DU PONT (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. THONE, Mr. WARE, and Mr. WON PAT) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

---

A BILL

To insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 403 of title 10 of the United States Code (relating to the Army Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 4346 the following new subsection:

"(e) Admission to the Academy shall be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

I

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 4342, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

(b) Chapter 603 of such title (relating to the Naval Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 6958 the following new subsection:

"(d) Admission to the Academy shall be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 6954, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

(c) Chapter 903 of such title (relating to the Air Force Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 9346 the following new subsection:

"(e) Admission to the Academy shall be made on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and

(c) of section 9342, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 2. Section 182 (a) of title 14 of the United States Code (relating to admission to the Coast Guard Academy) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following new sentence: "All such appointments shall be made without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of the applicants.".

SEC. 3. Section 216 (b) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1126 (b) (1), relating to admission to the Merchant Marine Academy) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "Appointments from each State shall be made" where it appears in the penultimate sentence the following: "without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of candidates";

(2) by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "sons and daughters".

SEC. 4. Section 901 (a) of the Education Amendments of 1972 (86 Stat. 373; 20 U.S.C. 1861 (a), relating to prohibition of sex discrimination and exceptions thereto) is amended by striking out paragraph (4) and redesignating paragraph (5), and any reference thereto, as paragraph (4).

93d CONGRESS
1st Session

H. R. 11711

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

November 30, 1973

Mr. du Pont (for himself, Mr. Biester, and Mr. Ryan) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

---

A BILL

To insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 403 of title 10 of the United States Code (relating to the Army Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 4346 the following new subsection:

"(e) Admission to the Academy shall be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

I

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 4342, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

(b) Chapter 603 of such title (relating to the Naval Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 6958 the following new subsection:

"(d) Admission to the Academy shall be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 6954, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

(c) Chapter 903 of such title (relating to the Air Force Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 9346 the following new subsection:

"(e) Admission to the Academy shall be made on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 9342, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 2. Section 182 (a) of title 14 of the United States Code (relating to admission to the Coast Guard Academy) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following new sentence: "All such appointments shall be made without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of the applicants.".

SEC. 3. Section 216 (b) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1126 (b) (1), relating to admission to the Merchant Marine Academy) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "Appointments from each State shall be made" where it appears in the penultimate sentence the following: "without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of candidates";

(2) by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "sons and daughters".

SEC. 4. Section 901 (a) of the Education Amendments of 1972 (86 Stat. 373; 20 U.S.C. 1861 (a), relating to prohibition of sex discrimination and exceptions thereto) is amended by striking out paragraph (4) and redesignating paragraph (5), and any reference thereto, as paragraph (4).

93D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 13729

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 26, 1974

Mr. KEMP introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

---

A BILL

To insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 403 of title 10 of the United States Code (relating to the Army Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 4346 the following new subsection:

"(e) Admission to the Academy shall be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

I—O

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 4342, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

(b) Chapter 603 of such title (relating to the Naval Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 6958 the following new subsection:

"(d) Admission to the Academy shall be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 6954, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

(c) Chapter 903 of such title (relating to the Air Force Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 9346 the following new subsection:

"(e) Admission to the Academy shall be made on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and

(c) of section 9342, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 2. Section 182 (a) of title 14 of the United States Code (relating to admission to the Coast Guard Academy) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following new sentence: "All such appointments shall be made without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of the applicants.".

SEC. 3. Section 216 (b) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1126 (b) (1), relating to admission to the Merchant Marine Academy) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "Appointments from each State shall be made" where it appears in the penultimate sentence the following: "without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of candidates";

(2) by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "sons and daughters".

SEC. 4. Section 901 (a) of the Education Amendments of 1972 (86 Stat. 373; 20 U.S.C. 1861 (a), relating to prohibition of sex discrimination and exceptions thereto) is amended by striking out paragraph (4) and redesignating paragraph (5), and any reference thereto, as paragraph (4).

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1974.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of the Department of Defense with respect to H.R. 10705, 93d Congress, a bill "To insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs."

The principal purpose of the bill is to admit women to the Military, Naval, Air Force, Coast Guard and Merchant Marine academies.

Insofar as the bill relates to the Coast Guard and Merchant Marine academies, the Department of Defense defers to the Departments of Transportation and Commerce respectively as to its merits.

There is a great demand for the services of graduates of the three service academies. For example, at the Naval Academy, the academic program is designed to train men for duty at sea by developing in them a solid foundation for seagoing skills. Similarly, the Military and Air Force academies mission is to produce male officers to fill combat billets. It is imperative that the maximum enrollment of males who may acquire this training be maintained. The current facilities at the academies are such that to admit females would be to reduce, by the number admitted, the number of critically needed males who receive this education. To be effective and worthwhile, any program of admission of females would have to envision substantial numbers. To do that and to reduce the attendance of males proportionately would work serious harm to fleet and combat units and other activities which have an increasing demand for Academy graduates.

In addition to academic pursuits, the curriculum at the service academies includes training for combat service. Congress has enacted statutes prohibiting women from being assigned to certain combat roles. Under section 6015 of title 10, United States Code, women serving in the Regular Navy and in Regular Marine Corps, are prohibited from being assigned to duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions or from being assigned to duty on vessels of the Navy other than hospital ships and transports. Under section 8549 of title 10, United States Code, female members of the Air Force, other than medical personnel, are prohibited from duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions. So long as these restrictions remain, participation by women in academy training would not be cost effective since the basic curriculum at the academies is directed toward preparing prospective officers for duty in a combat environment. The mission of the United States Military Academy is primarily to train cadets for careers in the combat arms of the Regular Army. Since the Department of the Army is opposed to women serving in combat, it is opposed to the admission of women to the Military Academy at this time.

There are numerous officer billets in the armed services, other than in combat roles, which are necessary to the effectiveness of the military services. Competence in these positions is no less important than in combat roles. The Department of Defense is intent on ensuring that opportunities for non-combat officers truly equate with those of combat officers.

There are alternative procurement sources for female officers that offer excellent education opportunities. The Reserve Officer Training Corps scholarship program has recently been opened to women. Through this program, young women may acquire their college education and military training at schools having co-educational facilities and offering the flexibility of courses to meet both their needs and the needs of the respective Services. The currently available procurement sources produce all of the female officers required by the Armed Services and provide for a high degree of selectivity.

If women were to be admitted to the service academies, it would be necessary to finance a changed curriculum and facilities for them.

For the foregoing reasons, the Department of Defense does not favor the enactment of H.R. 10705.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the Committee.

Sincerely,

W. P. CLEMENT.

Mr. Fisher. I did advise Mr. duPont who wants to be heard if he is here when we conclude today, if we have time before 12, we will hear him also as an accommodation and in response to his request.

Our first witness this morning will be Mrs. Pat Schroeder and we are delighted to have you, Mrs. Schroeder, as our first witness in this rather important hearing and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER, REPRESENTATIVE FROM COLORADO

Mrs. Schroeder. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I certainly appreciate the opportunity to appear here this morning as the committee begins hearings on whether or not women will be allowed to attend the service academies.

As everyone here is aware, on October 12, 1971, the House of Representatives did pass the equal rights amendment by a vote of 354 to 23 and subsequently, of course, the Senate completed congressional approval. The amendment, simply stated, provides that sex shall not be a factor in determining the legal rights of men and women. It recognizes the fundamental dignity and individuality of each human being and states as a policy what the policy of our Congress should be. If that amendment had passed all of the State legislatures, as it is now in the process of doing, then these hearings would be moot.

Mr. Chairman, the eventuality of the admission of women to the service academies is clear. My question is, why, then, is the Department of Defense so vehemently fighting the inevitable? I think one of the major reasons could be that maybe some of the important people in high positions are roadblocks, but, I think, one of the other things I have learned as a freshman here is that bureaucracies—and I think probably the service academies are also bureaucracies—often aren't too responsive to changing circumstances.

Some of the responses we often find are—the bureaucracy's first reaction is "We can't do that." Second is, "We've never done it that way before." And the third reaction is, "That's not our responsibility anyway." Bureaucracies seldom take a leadership role in changing policies which affect them, no matter how outdated the policies are. That is why I think this committee's role is very, very important. It seems to me often the bureaucracy has a sign over the door that says "We will discharge our business according to calculable rules and without regard to persons." I think we can also add changing times, changing circumstances, and anything else that might come to mind.

When I first came here I wrote to four service academies and asked whether they would accept female cadets. Like all Members of Congress I was concerned with the competitive system and how to administer it properly in doing the things in selecting candidates from my district.

The Merchant Marine Academy informed me that regulations required all cadets to be male citizens of the United States. So I wrote to the Secretary of Commerce, who has the authority under the Merchant Marine Act to revise the regulations pertaining to the Academy. They reviewed their policy and will now accept women applicants. I was delighted with the Secretary's decision, but as you know it is the exception and not the rule.

The Naval Academy sent back a letter I found very interesting because its "males only" policy was based on—what else—the regulations. That is always a kind of a copout, I think, but nevertheless that was the answer.

The Secretary of the Army said that its mission was to train career officers for combat in the Army and therefore women should not be admitted to West Point. He also went on to point out how expensive it was to build new facilities and devise new courses for women.

I think that is often heard, if I may step aside here for a moment. Many people say "You are asking for special favors, we would have to lower the standards, we would have to change the course, have to do this and that. No one is talking about that. They are talking instead about allowing people to apply on the same competitive system. We are not asking for a separate competitive system, we are not asking a quota or anything alse, but rather that sex would not be considered as a disqualifier before you got to any of the other qualifications.

The Secretary failed to note that only 15 percent of Army officer positions are combat.

Also, last year the Army opened up 434 of its 482 specialties to women. The Secretary did not say that women graduates couldn't serve in the remaining 85 percent of the Army officer positions. If we follow the Secretary of the Army's logic that the mission of the Academy is to train career officers for combat, then I suppose the logical mission of the ROTC program is to train for noncombat, because after all, women now make up 10 percent of the ROTC enrollment. I think the committee also knows that officer training schools also allow women to enter.

The Air Force Academy, after describing in some detail the problems that would accompany the admission of women, responded in fine bureaucratic form by passing the buck. In other words, "The Air Force policy of restricting admission to the Air Force Academy to males is based on the belief that this has been and remains the will of Congress."

I guess the Congressional Record that has the ERA results in it must not have gotten to them because I don't believe that is the belief and the will of Congress.

I can appreciate this sensitivity to the will of Congress, but I still don't recall the Air Force asking Congress for permission to illegally bomb Cambodia. The point is that when Congress passed the equal rights amendment, it did make a very clear statement as to whether this kind of exclusion should be permitted. If further proof of will is necessary, the Senate, led by Senators Stennis and Thurmond among others, has specifically endorsed the idea of allowing women in the academies.

In any event, that's it. Those are the varied service academy policies supporting the restriction to males only, and those who are making the policies seem to want to continue to restrict it to males only.

People ask me why do women want to go to service academies. I think they want to go for the same reason men want to go. They want to go for a variety of reasons. Some of them may want a military career, some come from military families, some want to be pilots, some may want to study oceanography, some may want to be close to home, and some may just want a good education. I don't think their reasons are any different from those of males.

Women seek, just as men, superior academy education that will give them superior job and career advancement opportunities within the military.

For those who point to ROTC as a source equal to the academies for young women, I have with me a chart, prepared by the Department of Defense, which should dispell any such notion. The chart shows the number of academy graduates as a percent of pay grade group. To one's surprise, as the pay grade goes up, the percentage of academy graudates goes up. Therefore, in order to open up full opportunities to women we should allow the women into the service academies, because we should have all levels of careers open.

I think another figure we should deal with, as I close, is that we now have 35 percent more women in uniform in our military today than we did 3 years ago, and they anticipate this figure will double by 1978. Therefore, I think we want to have women at all levels and we should start now.

Thank you very much.

[The chart submitted by Mrs. Schroeder follows:]

NUMBER OF ACADEMY GRADUATES AS A PERCENT OF PAY GRADE GROUP, JUNE 30, 1973

Pay grade	Army		Navy		Marines		Air Force	
	Academy graduates	Percent of grade	Academy graduates	Percent of grade	Academy graduates	Percent of grade	Academy graduates	Percent of grade
01	1,685	13.25	1,528	14.60	253	6.14	1,625	15.03
02	1,386	9.29	1,442	12.90	329	7.37	1,413	8.78
03	2,421	6.66	2,593	15.55	253	5.07	2,850	6.37
04	1,473	7.77	2,328	15.02	233	7.76	1,257	5.63
05	1,473	11.99	1,793	21.79	123	8.11	795	5.51
06	1,039	18.94	1,197	30.06	72	11.41	603	9.83
07	122	49.80	92	60.53	4	11.11	57	27.54
08	79	40.72	67	64.42	1	3.85	40	26.32
09	24	50.00	37	80.43	1	14.29	15	39.47
010	9	81.82	9	100.00	1	50.00	4	28.57

Mr. Fisher. Thank you, Mrs. Schroeder, for a very complete and very persuasive discussion of this subject matter.

Since you have dwelled at some length on a discussion of the combat aspect of the training in the various academies, I take it that you subscribe to the idea that if women are admitted to the academies, as you propose, that they be required to undergo the same obligation in regard to combat or noncombat that men are required to. Is that correct?

Mrs. Schroeder. I don't think women are asking for any special favoritism. As I say, no one is making them go, and I think if they elect to take that option, they are wanting to do what the others do. They are not asking for a special curriculum at all.

Mr. Fisher. In other words, you would have no objection to having the law, if it is enacted, make it clear that women, in regard to combat, would be treated in the academies and for the purpose of being admitted to the academies precisely like the men are. Is that correct?

Mrs. Schroeder. That is correct. And I think one of the things we get hung up on here is we don't realize how combat is assigned. Let's look at the Air Force Academy with their pilots. All pilots must be male because all pilots are required to do rotation.

As you know, that is a different kind of combat than being in a foxhole, so it is conceivable some women might select that kind whereas they would not in the other. There is a wide variety and range of job descriptions.

Mr. FISHER. What is your concept of the mission of our academies?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think it is to find the most qualified people we have in America who want to serve. This is not a question of taking the top 1 percent of every class and making them go. I think we would have a problem doing that. But we need the most qualified people who want to serve their country, and we need all the brainpower we can get. In the military today, we need an awful lot of brainpower because we are in a technology age. It is not so much the brute strength here as aptitude for technology. I think we need all the intelligence we can get, all the strategy we can get, the finest minds we can get, and the dedication.

Mr. FISHER. And that is your conception of the mission of the service academies?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is right. And I think the service academies should be selecting the creme de la creme and they should be training them.

Mr. FISHER. Getting back for a moment to the combat matter again, I believe as applied to West Point there is some prohibition in the law now related to women against training for combat purposes. I would assume from your prior answer that you would support a repeal of that provision as it is now in the law. Is that correct?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That would be the easiest way to deal with this probably, but I think still we have to remember that 85 percent of the Army officer positions are noncombat oriented. West Point is not just training people for that 15 percent, they are training people for all positions. So the committee could go either way. If it wishes to keep the law in effect that is now there, they can have women go through the training because they certainly would need to know it in their background in dealing with the tactics, strategy, et cetera. They need to know what is required, what goes into it, but they may not assign them to the actual mission if they wanted to comply with the law and have them go into the other 85 percent of officer positions that are noncombat in origin.

Mr. FISHER. But I understand your general position on this is that the law should treat all midshipmen and cadets alike.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is what the equal rights amendment says, and I think that will soon be the law.

Mr. FISHER. Therefore the requirements for admission to the various service academies should remove any distinction as applied to women and make it apply across the board to all of those who are admitted and make it precisely the same. Is that correct?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think we make the same standards for everyone; yes.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, you refer to the 15 percent and the 85 percent, which I suppose is based upon an average over a period of time. I am wondering if, in considering this thing, we should not assume for the purpose of planning our legislation that in case of some kind of war that might break out it might reverse itself and be 85 percent in combat and 15 percent in noncombat. I am talking about war plans, the possibilities, the potential of what we might be required to prepare for. Is that not a fair statement?

Mrs. **Schroeder.** That is a fair statement, Mr. Chairman, and I think you and I both came from the West, out in Marlboro country, and we know women helped win the West and that situation has been in effect. This is not a new role for women in our society.

Mr. **Fisher.** Is it your view that women should be required to register for Selective Service?

Mrs. **Schroeder.** At the moment, of course, I hope the volunteer army works. As you know, Congress is changing the Selective Service rule anyway. It has nothing to do with the equal rights amendment. Congress is the one who writes the draft law, and we could call up women if we needed them anyway. I think so much of this is really moot. If there were an all-out war situation we wouldn't be sitting around deciding whether or not we would be calling up women. If we really needed them, women wouldn't be saying "I am really sorry." At least I hope we are not raising that kind of a generation.

Mr. **Fisher.** I am not anticipating for the purposes of my question that we will renew the draft, but the present laws require all people to register. Is it your view that women as well as men should be required to register for military service?

Mrs. **Schroeder.** Not at the time because that is not the law. As you know, Congress makes that law.

Mr. **Fisher.** Do you think we should change the law? We could do that you know.

Mrs. **Schroeder.** I don't think that has anything to do with whether or not we let women into the academies. I don't think we should be making anybody register if we have a volunteer army.

Mr. **Fisher.** We are talking about military duty and military service up and down the line in the broader sense of the subject. Since you advocate equality of treatment across the board as applied to military service, do you see any valid reason why women should not be required to register just as men are?

Mrs. **Schroeder.** I think, if we are serious about the volunteer army, we shouldn't be having people register—period. If we are going to continue to have people register, I think it should be equal.

Mr. **Fisher.** That is what I wanted you to say. That settles that. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. **Wilson.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank you for your statement, Mrs. Schroeder. It was a fine statement.

Have you read the letter to the chairman of the full committee by Secretary Clements giving his reasons for opposing the admission of women to the service academies?

Mrs. **Schroeder.** Yes.

Mr. **Wilson.** What do you think of it? Be very frank, please.

Mrs. **Schroeder.** As I say, I think part of it is, "This is the way it has been, this is the way it will continue to be." The things about combat are out of date in many instances. He talks about expenses, but I don't see them being concerned about expense in other areas to build new restroom facilities. We could do the odd-even hours.

Mr. **Wilson.** The two principal things he comments on—it would require the reduction of the number of male students who are being trained for combat duty and the expense of having new facilities built.

I serve on the Military Construction Subcommittee, and I know that the facilities is not a problem. The cost of new facilities would be very simple in relationship to other things that are being done. We are talking now about spending a quarter of a million dollars for a temporary headquarters for the Chief of Naval Operations in the event they give up his home on Observatory Hill. That is only for a temporary situation. Obviously they could find the money for things they want to find it for if there is a requirement for it.

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I am glad you pointed that out. I am very sensitive to that. I went to Harvard after they let women in, and I got so tired of the dean saying how many volumes he could have bought for the library if they had not had to build a women's restroom.

Mr. **Wilson**. They do have different standards for men at the service academies at the present time. Mr. Fisher asked you whether you felt there should be a different standard as applied to women, unless I misunderstood him. They do make different standards at the Air Force Academy and the Naval Academy for athletes. They have very strict vision standards for all entrants unless they are good football players, and then they can waive that requirement and make exceptions. Obviously they are not being trained for combat because the purpose of having the vision requirement is supposed to make them more able for combat duty.

In the case of nurses that have served in several wars, they have been in combat, I would think, and performed excellently. I have never seen any criticism of the role they have played right in the frontlines in doing the type of work they have been doing. Would you agree women have proved themselves in this respect in past wars?

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I would agree. I have a cousin who was a nurse in World War II, and the hospital she was working in was hit.

Mr. **Wilson**. I have been on the Air Force Academy Board of Visitors, and I know according to the Superintendent of the Air Force Academy, he has never felt this would present any great problem. He is just waiting for guidance from Congress on the matter, and they have a contingency plan prepared to go into effect. Within a year or 2 years' time, they think they can be prepared to handle women cadets. I think it is a matter of the mind and some of this old-fashioned business you made reference to, that the regulations say this or say that and so forth.

I support your legislation. I may be one of the few on the committee that does, Mrs. Schroeder, but I think it is something that is going to come eventually; it is something that is necessary to guarantee that we do get the most qualified people for all jobs in the military.

You mentioned that only 15 percent of the people go into combat now, and I don't visualize any change whereby 5 percent would be in combat, because we know that support troops traditionally require 5 to 1 behind the combat troops support. This has been so in wartime and all kinds of situations, so it is not realistic to suppose the percentages would switch around during any particular time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I think we make exceptions for some foreign students to come in.

Mr. **Wilson**. Thank you. I meant to bring that up. I thought concerning the reduction that Mr. Clements is concerned about in his letter, the ones we could start with would be the foreign students. Some of our military people have made deals and said, "All we have to do is ram a bill through Congress, and we can take the general's son or the admiral's son." And we have done this in a couple of instances here recently—Iran last year, and we just did it in our committee for Laos this year. To me this is a real misuse of the admission procedures for the Academies, and I think the committee, Mr. Chairman, should study this whole business of foreign students coming into the military academies, and have some very strict procedures. They are too loose at the present time, in my opinion.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, would like to compliment our colleague for her statement and welcome you here this morning.

I think we are embarking on a very interesting series of hearings here that should provoke a good bit of controversy and comment.

I would say in the beginning that I am not in favor of your bill, but let me say with equal force I am not opposed to it. I have an absolutely open mind on the subject, and I am sure that I will ask some questions in the course of the hearing that might tend to indicate I am opposed to it, but if this should be the case, I am just being the devil's advocate.

I have to disagree with part of what you say though. The mission of the service academies, taking West Point as an example, as I understand it, is to turn out combat officers, a well-rounded officer who is a professional and who can serve in any capacity, whether it be combat or noncombat. But he must be capable of performing a combat role. You don't seriously advocate the thought that a woman should be capable of being a platoon leader in combat, do you, in Vietnam, Korea, whatever? Do you really think we should train women to be platoon leaders in a combat situation?

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I think women have been in those kinds of situations in other armies in the world. I don't think there is anything unique about a woman that says she can't do it.

Mr. **Dickinson**. That doesn't answer my question, although it tends to answer the question. Are you seriously advocating that women be required to go through the same rigorous physical training and be just as physically and mentally capable of being a platoon leader in a combat situation in the jungle or anyplace as the men? There would be no distinction made in your curriculum in that training?

Mrs. **Schroeder**. That is right. I have not been at West Point, but I did go out to the Air Force Academy. I talked to cadets about training for combat and talked to the ones who were being graduated, and I said, where are you going, where are you going? They were going to medical schools, they were going off to study labor relations in Valley Forge, they were going off to take pilot training somewhere else. I have yet to find the first guy who was going into the jungle somewhere. They have had training so they know how to cope with that, so they know what that means, and I think that is important because, as I say, we need good heads for strategy and planning and figuring out maneuvers and what we did and that kind of thing. So I say, yes, they ought to participate in the training. But this is not as though everyone from West Point and the Air Force Academy starts out on bombing missions and immediately moves into a trench with a sleeping bag.

Mr. **Dickinson**. I understand what you are saying, and you make a fine argument, if you want an argument. But I was asking for a fact. Do you advocate there be no difference in the curriculum, that they do the same physical training, be just as combat ready and qualified as the men, and be used in that role in the event we have a war? Is this what you are advocating?

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I don't see anything wrong with that.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Then the answer would be yes.

Mrs. **Schroeder**. OK.

Mr. **Dickinson**. I have to get an answer. Of course we can keep dancing around.

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I will answer with yes, but I am only saying that I don't think that is quite the issue because many——

Mr. **Dickinson**. That is the issue I am asking of you now.

Mrs. **Schroeder**. Yes; I don't think women want to be treated differently. They don't want to be carried on a sedan chair.

Mr. **Dickinson**. I think in our minds at least, if we want to be pragmatic, and I think we have to be, we have to recognize there is a difference and there are roles that women can fill that are nonphysical in nature. They can be just as important in a combat condition as far as the country is concerned without them actually having to slog through the rice paddies and so forth with a pack on their back. I think practically, you will have to recognize that, and if we in fact pass this we must come to grips with this too.

You were asked this question which you didn't quite answer directly. As a part of any bill we pass making women admissible into service academies, would you favor making a part of that bill a provision to rescind the law prohibiting women from combat?

Mrs. **Schroeder**. No; I don't think we have to do that at all. I think you can deal with this bill without dealing with that law. I don't think anyone in the room wants to go out and do combat. I think you could poll the American people and there is no question nobody wants to do it. So I think when we talk about whether they want to do it is one thing; whether we can do it and whether we shouldn't have some women trained, at least, to know about it, is another question. I think that is what we should be directing this to.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Let me ask you to respond to this if you would, which is in the Secretary's letter—"Under section 8549 of title 10, United States Code, female members of the Air Force, other than medical personnel, are prohibited from duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions. So long as these restrictions remain, participation by women in academy training would not be cost effective since the basic curriculum at the academies is directed toward preparing prospective officers for duty in a combat environment."

He says a change would be necessary because of this. Would you comment on that please?

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I will comment on that because, as I say, when I visited the Air Force Academy and talked to the cadets, I only found one out of the group that I talked to going into these positions. Granted, I didn't talk to everyone there. One was going into flight training, others were going to medical schools, into labor relations training, any number of other things.

I can tell you in all honesty when I went to my university, I wanted to go in the Air Force ROTC program. I wanted to learn how to fly. They told me, "you can't because you are a woman." I said that has nothing to do with whether or not I could fly. I wanted to take the course. I wanted to learn to fly, and they had a fine course.

As you know, the Navy is using women pilots and they fly the same kind of aircraft. I don't see that as a big hangup.

I think that law probably could be changed in regards to that, but I think it is still separate from whether or not women should get into the academies because it is not like every cadet instantly goes out and trains for a combat flying role.

Mr. DICKINSON. I understand what you say, but, if I might distill it down, you say you would agree that the law should be changed so that there would be no prohibition against women going into combat situations because that is the purpose of the academies. Would that be a correct paraphrase?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am saying I don't think it is needed in this instance.

Mr. DICKINSON. You don't think it is necessary even though the statute specifically prohibits it?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If I could go further, I would deal with that law that says that women can't be combat pilots. I think women could be combat pilots.

Mr. DICKINSON. That might be. I am just asking if you would comment on the statement made by the Deputy Secretary that they are specifically prohibited under present law.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think he is wrong in his interpretation.

Mr. DICKINSON. I see. That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hillis.

Mr. HILLIS. I too would like to compliment my colleague in coming and testifying before the committee this morning. I have just a few questions, Mrs. Schroeder, that I would like to have your comment on.

As I understand the present makeup of the Air Force Academy, 25 percent of the people who are taken will not qualify for flight training for physical reasons, so they are designated immediately upon admission as going to take up an administration role. Are you familiar with this?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is right.

Mr. HILLIS. So right off, the Air Force Academy says 25 percent of the men will not go to combat, but will serve in some other capacity.

It seems to me, in listening to your testimony and reflecting on what you are talking about, we kind of live in an age of specialization not only in the military but in all pursuits of life in our country today. In fact, I believe you are a specialist in your field of labor relations in the law, and certainly I think this is true in the military, is it not?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think so; yes.

Mr. HILLIS. The point I am getting at, and I think you hit on it very well a minute ago, is that perhaps the academies, while they do train for combat, bring together the very finest youth we have in the country today to be trained as specialists in other fields of the military that we need in leadership.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is right. I think our most important natural resource in this country is the people, the youth, and if we are going to deny ourselves 50 or 51 or 52 percent of the youth of the Nation their input into military policy, I think we are making a great mistake.

Mr. HILLIS. I think I agree with you on that point.

It seems to me that a great stress is put on combat assignments, and of course, this is important; but also I think the service academies are training a professional officer corps—in other words the leadership of the military in the future. That becomes basically the nucleus of the cadre and that is where we have to look for leadership. Also, as we call upon women to serve more and more in the volunteer force, it is only best they have the best leaders too. Isn't that true?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I agree fully.

Mr. HILLIS. I want to ask you a little bit about combat assignments. I am interested in flying. Recently I got to meet a young lady who just graduated as a pilot in the Navy. She is down at Patuxent Naval Air Station at the present time. I believe she told me her assignment was a copilot on the Ryan antisubmarine airplane which goes on long missions. To my way of thinking that could in times of war be in combat, could it not?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I would think so. They don't classify it as that, but I would think it is very possible if we had a war situation.

Mr. HILLIS. I could see where there would be some quasi or nearby combat assignments that women could serve in quite well. Don't you feel this way?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. For example, the nurse in the hospital I think is an excellent example. Hospitals aren't supposed to be hit but many people have lost their lives in hospitals.

Mr. HILLIS. This is true, but I'm thinking that sitting in the right seat of an airplane on antisubmarine patrol might put you closer to combat than a nurse's assignment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. You need a computer to figure out the odds.

Mr. HILLIS. Probably we would never see in this country a time women graduates at the Air Force Academy would be assigned to F-15's. I wouldn't want that myself. I think there are many roles that women can serve just as well as a man. In other assignments it perhaps relieves the pilot so we can have more pilots for F-15's. Perhaps you don't agree with me on this. This area is a gray area and one that gives as many problems to the bills as any. How do you see this affecting women's assignments in the future of the service?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am a great historian and have just finished reading about different armies. The invasion of Egypt, the Blue Nile, is fascinating from way back, and how we keep increasing the number of support troops. This goes way back and moves on forward to the British landing there with their camels. We know that the number of actual hard combat positions are very small, and so to deny women because of this small percentage of numbers alone is wrong.

Probably you and I would disagree as to whether or not women should be in the combative roles. I see nothing wrong with the women fighter pilots if the women want to be that. We are not going to make a woman be one that doesn't want to be, and I don't think we could.

If they want to do it, I think it is probably all right. That is probably where we differ.

As I say, I don't think we have to deal with that so much in this bill, because there are so many other areas in the military that have high command positions, high officers in charge where women could certainly do it. There is no one questioning whether or not women could do those jobs. And the service academies are training for those specialist areas also. It is not like everyone instantly goes into combat upon graduation.

Mr. HILLIS. Right. If women were admitted to the academies, would you anticipate that in the course of service in the military they would take up more command positions? In other words, they would occupy a slot of a battalion commander with an infantry brigade or even a regimental commander, something like that?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. They might. I suppose it is going to depend on the rotation structure which, as you know, Admiral Rickover and others have been questioning, too, as to how much rotation we should have, how broad it should be, or should be more within your specialized areas. As you know, it tends to be broader. You rotate through a broad variety of jobs horizontal rotation as well as vertical. There are many people who think our services are not recognizing the specialization and it should be more vertical rotation than the horizontal.

That gets us off into labor relations and job descriptions and job ladders and careers and all of this type of thing. I think those are questions we should look at as a committee further on down the line. But I think that whether or not we are going to let women into the academies we shouldn't make that decision based upon how we are going to rotate officers and how broad it is going to be and whether or not they are going to become battalion commanders.

Mr. HILLIS. I know, but I think in looking at the decision insofar as letting women into the academies you are deciding really what role they are going to portray in the future in the service of our country. Are they going to come up and become general officers? Of course we have some now.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. We do have some now, right.

Mr. HILLIS. I mean more in a combat position. I think this is a serious question that needs to be addressed.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think you are going to see more participation in all areas. There is no question about that. As I say, too, we have to realize the technology makes combat a little different. It has almost become more like a chess game with more mental things, so much technology. It is not nearly as direct one to one as the trenches of World War I. That is probably never going to come back again. It may, and if it does, we may all be in them whether we like it or not. It would be moot again. It is like the West. If the Indians were attacking a cabin, the women didn't say "You don't seem to understand me. My role as a woman doesn't include combat. Don't give me that rifle." So it may be moot on that situation too.

I think there is no question the trend is coming to broader participation in all of the different areas.

Mr. HILLIS. Thank you. That is all the questions I have.

Mr. FISHER. Mrs. Holt.

Mrs. HOLT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to commend our colleague, too. I have seen her walk in the lion's den before, but, as usual, she is well prepared and knows her facts. Very good.

Mrs. **Schroeder**. Thank you.

Mrs. **Holt**. Mrs. Schroeder, have you done or has anyone done any research into the number of applications we have had? I don't know whether this is relevant or not, but when I went to the Air Force Academy I talked with General Clark there and, as Mr. Wilson said, he stated he was ready, he could receive women into the academy there immediately, but that he felt it would be better if they had a class of 100 that came in together. I went to law school with 5 in 500. I wondered, do you think that would make a difference in the administration?

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I don't think so. I think that is the thing Mr. Clements would say, that you are taking 100 combat positions away. You would have to have a quota system and everything else. What we want to do is open it up and be judged equally like everyone.

In law school certainly that is how we were treated. In my law class we were 15 out of 530, and then they counted after they let us all in and let in 15 more males. They can even do that. I don't care.

Mrs. **Holt**. Has anybody taken any kind of poll of how many women applicants have been named?

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I don't know. I could say in our district we accepted applications from everyone, and the top applicant in the district on everybody's standards turned out to be a woman. I don't know anyone who has collected all of the data from all of the districts and put that together.

Mrs. **Holt**. I think there would be a point in doing that.

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I think a very good point.

Mrs. **Holt**. And to look at that and see what we come up with then.

Thank you very much. That is all of the questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. **Schroeder**. Thank you.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Daniel.

Mr. **Daniel**. Mrs. Schroeder, you are not very serious about this bill, are you?

Mrs. **Schroeder**. No. I am just here because I didn't have anything else to do this morning, Mr. Daniel.

Mr. **Daniel**. Mr. Chairman, I support the principle advocated by the gentlewoman from Colorado. She and I have discussed this matter, and I say that I favor it provided that we allow the services sufficient timelag in order that the program will be assured of success.

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I think certainly one would be able to be ready. Nobody wants to just come roaring through. It doesn't take very long to get the facilities brought up to date. As you said, I don't think they are asking any special favors. I think it could be done very quickly.

Mr. **Daniel**. What do you have in mind as a timelag, 1978 maybe; 1976?

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I think probably the persons best able to testify on that are going to be the administrative superintendents, but I imagine the main difference would probably be living quarters and whether or not there are adequate living quarters and how this could be handled.

Mr. **Daniel.** And probably some psychological adjustments.

Mrs. **Schroeder.** Do you think it is that hard to get used to women?

Mr. **Daniel.** They are certainly not difficult for me to get accustomed to.

Mrs. **Schroeder.** I think most of these gentlemen have been exposed to women. As I understand it, they all had mothers, so I assume they are going to get used to them. I imagine the main thing is going to be a dormitory.

I came from a coeducational university that had dorms.

I did read one affidavit from one of the gentlemen who was running a college saying that women required more diminutive furniture, and they had to eat more often, but I think the women will be able to deal with that, probably eat on the same schedule, attend the same classes, and I don't think you will have to get more diminutive furniture for us either. I think it is basically determining how to figure out the dorm situation.

Mr. **Daniel.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Montgomery?

Mr. **Montgomery.** Good morning, Mrs. Schroeder.

I don't know how to start. I am one of those members on the committee who really hasn't made up his mind, Mr. Chairman, on this situation.

I have read the testimony of Mr. Stratton and also of Mrs. Schroeder. I would just like to ask a couple of questions, if I may. I am having a problem in getting enough qualified applications of young men interested in going to West Point. I don't have this problem at the Naval Academy or the Air Force Academy.

Pat, do you have any idea if this will, as far as the Army is concerned, increase the applications to West Point if we would enact such legislation?

Mrs. **Schroeder.** It is hard to guess. As I say, we are automatically cutting out 51 percent of the constituents in your district if we don't let women at least attempt to apply. Hopefully, some would be interested in going to West Point. I think we all understand why people aren't as interested in going to West Point. I think probably everyone has that problem in their district.

The main reason is males as well as females may not be quite as interested in the combative roles. They are really still down there in their brown shoes fighting in tanks or something, and that is not as much fun as being on a submarine, a carrier deck, or being in the air. I can understand that human motivation.

I am not sure what we would do about the West Point problem, but certainly at least it would allow 51 percent more of your constituents to at least attempt to compete for it.

Mr. **Montgomery.** Yes. I am not getting the good applications. It is rather surprising that with a $50,000 or $60,000 free education a year that these young people are not coming in for West Point.

My other question might have been asked, and really I am seeking information when I ask you. In the nations that have been in combat recently and are in combat now, are women participating actually in combat; Israel, Syria? I can probably mention North and South Vietnam. They are not over there.

Mrs. Schroeder. As you know, even Russia in World War II had women fighter pilots. I know of one woman fighter pilot who shot down over seven German airplanes. The Russians have used women probably more in military positions, but they classify combat sometimes differently than we do. Everybody has different classifications, so it is so hard to compare apples and oranges.

Mr. Montgomery. You went to Israel.

Mrs. Schroeder. In Israel they really didn't have them in the trenches, but they had them in the lines coming forward and going backward, and doing all sorts of supportive things that we may or may not classify as combat depending on which service you are in, et cetera, but they were very active. I mean they weren't sitting at a desk somewhere in an air-conditioned office. They were out in the field working on maintenance, working on all sorts of things, very proud. Many people feel that women are maybe better at maintenance because they have smaller fingers and more manual dexterity.

The Russians have used women much more in all fields than our country, especially in the space thing. They have women in the space program, because it is also through their military. We have always been very concerned about keeping up with them, so I think maybe we need some feminine input to match theirs at those high levels.

Mr. Montgomery. What about Egypt and Syria?

Mrs. Schroeder. Egypt and Syria, I don't think have worked that all out yet. Women have not moved into that, but part of that is the employment problem there. They have so much unemployment. As you know, in Egypt there are troops standing around on the corners right now. Sadat literally doesn't dare demobilize and they need the employment for the breadwinner. It is a little different problem. I think you have to look at industrialized nations probably with the same kind of armed services and armed forces that we have.

Mr. Montgomery. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wilson. One of the questions Mr. Montgomery asked I thought was interesting. That is the difficulty he is having in getting applicants for West Point. I have a similar problem in my district.

Mrs. Schroeder, do you have any feeling about how you would allow women equally to go into the academies? How would you handle a problem like this where they might all apply for the Air Force or Naval Academy and no one would apply for West Point? Would it be proper to assign them? Obviously you are going to have to set some limitations on how many, male or female, go to a particular academy.

Mrs. Schroeder. That is an awfully hard question that I think we all have to deal with practically.

I am also concerned that the people are in the academies because they really want to be there and not because it is a freebee or one of those things because I think that can be very damaging, too. We just try to be honest and I think that is the main thing you would do with women.

If every woman who came into your office wanted to go to the Naval Academy or the Air Force Academy, you could say that is fine, but I want to tell you that I hear that from everyone else. You may want to go home and read the brochures and rethink it. But, on the other hand, if she is really not interested in going to West Point, I think it would be a great disaster to tell her she has to go, just as I think it would be with a young male.

I don't know how you would motivate people, how you activate them. I am not sure.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you very much, Mrs. Schroeder.

Our next witness is our distinguished colleague from the State of New York, where West Point is located, Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Stratton, we have heard about this legislation from the feminine viewpoint, we will say. Now we want to get it from the horse's mouth. We want to get it from one who is, I know, quite familiar with the curriculum and the procedures that are followed at West Point as well as the other academies.

We, of course, all respect your views as we do those of Mrs. Schroeder.

You may proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON, REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW YORK

Mr. STRATTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

I appear here this morning as a cosponsor of H.R. 11268, to urge the committee to approve the bill. I speak as a senior member of the committee, who indeed is often classed as belonging to the committee's more conservative and militant wing. I also speak as a long-time member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy, and as a long-time member with over 31 years, 6 of those on active duty, of the U.S. Naval Reserve.

I have long favored the admission of women to the service academies, long before it became so fashionable in the House and the Senate, and as a member of the Naval Academy's Board of Visitors over a period of years I urged some 3 years ago the admission of women and warned academy officials at that time they were opposing the inevitable; and instead of thinking up reasons to keep women out, they ought to be making plans to make their admission a simpler and less traumatic experience.

Mr. Chairman, let me say in all candor that I do not regard the official Department of Defense report on our bill—the letter from Secretary Clements, which he signed, which was referred to earlier in the hearings—as a serious document or even as worthy of what should regularly and predictably be the intellectual level of the Department of Defense. They have no official arguments, only excuses. In fact their official response makes it clearer than ever that the overwhelming bulk of the opposition to women in the service academies—as the gentlewomen from Colorado has just said—is based on nothing more than inertia and resistance to change.

Actually, as members of this distinguished subcommittee are well aware, there is nothing new about women in the U.S. Armed Forces. We had them in World War I, and we had them in far greater numbers in World War II—nurses, administrators, yoemen, ferry pilots.

And in recent years, under pressure from the women's movement and Members of Congress, we are enlisting women in all our services, admitting them to ROTC, to the Navy's Officer Candidate School at Newport, R.I.; the Navy has commissioned two women as pilots; we have a woman admiral and several women generals now; in the Army a woman has been placed in command of male troops stationed overseas; and the Merchant Marine Academy, one of the Nation's traditional service academies, has already opened its ranks to women applicants, all without having the world collapse.

So, what is all the fuss about? If women can do all these things—including attend the Merchant Marine Academy—what is so unique or forbidding that the Republic would somehow crumble overnight if women were to be admitted to West Point, Annapolis, or the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs? In general three reasons have been given for opposing such admission:

(1) Need for added facilities,

(2) the service academies train only combat personnel, and

(3) the discipline, if we use a polite euphemism, of the Academies' procedures would be unduly harsh on women cadets and midshipmen.

Let me examine each of these in order.

First, with respect to facilities. This matter has already been addressed in the colloquies with Mrs. Schroeder. This, in my judgment, is utter nonsense. If women want to go to the service academies they must be prepared to live under the ascetic conditions that prevail there for men. In fact I don't even see any reason why there should be any change in the dormitory situation. The only physical changes that would be required would be the addition, or conversion, of a few female bathroom facilities. Compared to the normal MilCon budget originating from the three academies each year, as the gentleman from California, Mr. Wilson, had mentioned a moment ago, this expense would be peanuts.

I recall, it seems to me, it was during World War II that President Franklin Roosevelt went to sea on a number of occasions and the press wanted to go along with him and that indomitable lady from Maine, Mae Craig, was refused the opportunity to go out on a naval ship because they said they had no restroom facilities for her. Finally President Roosevelt prevailed. They undertook the tremendous burden of designating one of the heads on the *Houston*, I think it was, for women, and the matter was settled and Mae Craig went to sea.

It is also suggested, if I may interpolate in my remarks, that there have got to be some different courses for women. That, too, is utterly ridiculous. If they want to go to the Academies, they should take exactly the same courses, and I see no reason for making any change whatsoever in course procedures.

Second—and this is something that has not been mentioned in the Department's letter, but it is the kind of thing that is breezed around the corridors—the matter of Academy "discipline," or what is really involved, Academy "Mickey Mouse." These are the sophomoric, neanderthal traditional practices that still apply at West Point and Colorado Springs, and to a somewhat lesser degree at Annapolis, designed to inflict physical and psychological punishment on new plebe cadets and midshipmen to "condition" them to the rigid disciplinary procedures of service Academy life as contrasted with civilian life on the outside. Actually, there is no excuse for these practices in the military academies anyway. The Navy has wisely taken some steps to modify them. They ought to be abolished altogether, and if the admission of women is needed to do it we ought to admit women to the Academies for that purpose alone. No such procedures apply in ROTC and very few apply in OCS. Yet there is no statistical proof whatsoever that "Beast Barracks" at West Point leads to significantly improved intellectual or combat capabilities when West Point graduates reach the combat field.

Discipline is, of course, a necessary part of military life, and must apply to women as well as men. In fact most women exceed men in their ability to adhere to such rigid procedures. Childish abuse, designed primarily to allow sophomores to take out on the freshmen the indignities that they themselves endured a year ago, is totally indefensible in the academies whether we ever admit women or not.

Finally, the argument about combat.

Let me say with all the emphasis that I can command that this is also unmitigated nonsense.

Graduates of Annapolis who cannot meet the eye test are commissioned in the Supply Corps; some of these may go to sea, but so do Navy nurses now. Some whose color vision proves defective, like Roger Staubach, don't even have to serve; they can move directly into a career in professional football. Until this year the Naval Academy had a premedical program—and the Air Force Academy, as the gentlewoman from Colorado has indicated also has one. Its participants became doctors, not combat line officers. The program was terminated this year and I suspect that it may be because its existence, as I have frequently pointed out to the Navy when they raised this point about combat careers, was a living refutation of their constant claim—still embodied in the DOD report on our bill—that all academy graduates are programed for combat line careers.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is that service academy training gives almost no military or combat training to its graduates whatsoever. These are primarily engineering schools, and I think most experts would regard them as second-rate engineering schools.

There is some exposure to military life during the summer vacations. The naval midshipmen sail abroad, sometimes in combat vessels and sometimes in transports. There is some exposure at West Point during the summer vacations up in the hills of Camp Buckner and they get to see what a rifle looks like and they fire one once or twice; but basically they are not combat schools, and you are no better trained to be a platoon commander when you get out of West Point or out of Annapolis than you are to be a lawyer when you graduate from Harvard before going to law school.

As for the quality of the academic program as I have said, Admiral Rickover has occasionally felt that it didn't entirely measure up to the first rank qualifications of an engineering school.

The same is true for the Air Force and the Army. Only a portion of Air Force Academy graduates fly. And only a portion of them end up flying in combat, believe it or not, as Mrs. Schroeder has again pointed out very properly and very succinctly. Many Air Force Academy graduates end up in missile sites in North Dakota, or as ground officers on air bases. Are these really combat roles in any meaningful sense of the word? A woman silo officer could be killed in a direct hit on a silo, but so could a lot of other civilian women with the same hit on the same North Dakota missile site.

The same is true of the Army. As the gentlewoman from Colorado has indicated, there is a certain aura of mystic feeling around this notion of combat, I think, which we have really lost sight of. Some day we ought to figure out just how many men in a typical combat infantry division, for example, ever really fire a rifle. I spent 2 years overseas in World War II, most of it with the Army, as an intelligence officer. As a naval officer, I served under General MacArthur, and he merged the services out there without waiting for an act of Congress. I went ashore in three combat landings; I interrogated prisoners in the frontlines; I dug foxholes and ducked falling bombs and never once fired a shot in anger. I try to convince my children I was some kind of war hero, but I have often wondered privately—including during some of those moments in the foxholes—how much of my job could probably have been performed just as well by a qualified woman. Almost all of it, I'm afraid.

Let me give you some statistics, if I may, which I have collected with regard to where these graduates of our service academies actually go as far as combat is concerned:

The West Point class of 1973 had 944 graduates, and 899 of them were commissioned in the Army, 31 in the Air Force, 1 in the Marine Corps, 10 foreign students, and 3 medically disqualified. Of that 899, 162 went into noncombat assignments; 63 into the Signal Corps, 43 into military intelligence, 22 into the Military Police—and we have women directing our traffic in New York City and elsewhere—34 into combat service support. In fact, 56 also went into the Engineer Corps, and I am not sure whether you could really call that combat.

Take the Naval Academy. They graduated 889, and 888 are commissioned. Of those 136 went into the Marines, and 750 went into the Navy. Of that 750, there were 194 that went into nuclear power. There were 5 who went into Special Warfare. I think there is some question as to whether you would call those really combat assignments. There were 19 others: 2 went into Public Affairs, 1 into Special Duty Intelligence, 1 into Special Duty Security Guard, 12 into the Supply Corps, and 3 into the Civil Engineers.

In the Air Force Academy, there were 844 who got degrees, and 834 were commissioned in the Air Force. And 196 of those 834 went into directed duty assignments which means noncombat. Of the others who went into combat roles, 485 went into pilot training, 27 went into helicopter training, and 87 went into navigation training. Again, I don't know whether the navigation training can really be regarded as combat or not. These 196 "directed duty assignments," incidentally, break down into a number of different categories, but mostly they were administrative, or missile launch officers, personnel officers, civil engineers, et cetera. Six went into graduate school. This has already been mentioned. I guess this must be the labor relations training that the gentlewoman referred to; 26 to medical school and 7 to law school. So let's not kid ourselves that these schools are designed only to train combat officers.

I am not suggesting that we ought to have women in combat, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure. Certainly they don't have women firing rifles even in the Israeli Army, as has already been indicated, but the fact of the matter is that the definition of combat is a whole lot narrower than many people—especially those who have never been in combat—think it is. There are an infinite number of very important combat support assignments that women can fill, in the combat zone, without ever having to fire a rifle: intelligence, medical, aviation, auto maintenance, communications, logistics. We now have Academy graduates filling those jobs; colonels, lieutenant colonels, and so on.

For that matter, there are an awful lot of shipboard jobs in the Navy that don't involve direct "combat" either, including our whole nuclear Polaris fleet. Do women automatically have to be disqualified from such assignments? To be sure, they might themselves be killed, but as we learned in Britain and Germany and Russia in World War II, the frontlines in modern warfare include the homefront. Women and children died in those conflicts even though they never saw a uniform, much less a service academy.

I think we have got to recognize when it comes to combat that there is this distinction, Mr. Chairman, between killing somebody else and being killed yourself. It is the latter we really have in mind when we say combat. You can go into the combat zone and you can run the risk of being killed, but you don't have to lead a platoon through the mud or stand behind a machinegun. I have often thought—this is a digression but I can't help saying so—that the matter of conscientious objection in the case of people in recent years in going into the service has supposedly been an objection to killing other people, but I have thought in many cases it was really just a conscientious objection to being shot at.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, the services need qualified women today more than the women need the services. We on this committee know all too well that the Volunteer Army is not working out. We need more volunteers. We need more highly qualified and more highly motivated volunteers. This is what women can do for us today in the armed services, as Mrs. Schroeder has very aptly said. We need people who are interested in this, and are enthusiastic about it, and that is what we could get in terms of West Point applicants or others. And if we enlist women today as privates and apprentice seamen, we also have an obligation to allow them to serve as officers as well. And if we do accept them as officers, then they deserve to be trained at the same Academies—as well as the same universities—as the men. We can't relegate women in the service to some female ghetto.

Frankly, I don't expect that even if we pass this bill we are going to be deluged with women applicants.

There are 10-percent women, according to the gentlewoman from California, in the ROTC now. I would assume there would be somewhat less applying for the service academy life, because it is not exactly a bed of roses. But I believe the women we do get will add a great deal, in brains and in enthusiasm—and these are the two things that we are looking for most in the Volunteer Army today—to our service academies. It is time for us to pass this bill, Mr. Chairman, and it is time for us to tell the service academies to grow up, get rid of their Mickey Mouse, and catch up with the rest of America and the rest of the world.

Mr. **Fisher**. Thank you, Mr. Stratton, for a very enlightening discussion of this subject. I am personally learning quite a bit this morning about the Academies that I didn't know before, and the training and preparation that is accorded to those who are fortunate enough to attend these various Academies.

I think the general public is under the impression that when some young man or woman, if that occurs in the future, is admitted to one of the Academies, that they are sent there at considerable cost to the taxpayers, with the idea of being oriented into an area of combat service if and when that should be required. The taxpayers are willing to spend that kind of money for the specialized preparation, whatever it is, and whatever may be required, to enable the students to defend the country if and when the occasion should arise.

I, of course, am quite aware of the fact that only a limited number are actually assigned to these combat roles to which you refer, but my thinking had been that at least the graduates are in a position to be assigned to combat roles if the occasion should require—if emergencies should arise—and they should have the basic training that supposedly enables them to qualify as experts in this field and to respond to any requirement that might arise.

You have presented, and so has Mrs. Schroeder, very convincing arguments on this subject, and I like to think, too, that I am open-minded on it. I have made no commitment one way or the other. It is an interesting subject. I think we need to explore it very thoroughly.

An awful lot of money goes into these academies. Let's be sure we are proceeding on the right course.

Mr. **Stratton**. Mr. Chairman, if I could respond to that, I think there is no question about the fact that the purpose of the academies is to try to attract and train career officers in the services. The one thing that they still have over the ROTC, the Holloway plan and all the rest, is retention rates.

Mrs. Schroeder's chart indicates that the higher you get in the rank structure, the greater the percentage of academy graduates. That may be to some extent the impact of the WPPA, the West Point Protective Association, but I think it is more the fact that 4 years of that kind of a setting of rigid discipline in the academies gives a person a commitment to a military life so that he sticks it out to get up to colonel and general. I don't dispute this.

I think this is exactly what we are trying to do, but I see no reason why women can't have the same enthusiasm and the same dedication; and certainly the purpose is to gear people for combat, but the first point is that you don't get the combat training in the academies. The second point is that when you talk about combat, you really cover a whole wide range of different things.

In the Navy the fellow who stands on the bridge directing the ship can, of course, be killed if there is a direct hit on the bridge, but that is not combat in the same sense as when you have a woman leading a platoon through the mud with a pack on her back and rifle in her hand and throwing hand grenades right and left, as Mr. Dickinson indicated a moment ago. I personally would say that if a woman wants to get into the Navy, she ought to be willing to take her chances on the bridge along with the men. I think we ought to repeal the law that says that women cannot fly and cannot serve in the combat area except Navy nurses. I think anybody who wants to serve in a combat support role ought to be allowed to serve.

You could have women intelligence officers, women personnel officers, in divisional headquarters. Not too many people in the divisional headquarters I was in got killed in World War II but occasionally you could get hit by a bomb or something of that kind; but you are performing an important combat role, and there is no reason why women couldn't do it as well as men, in my judgment.

Mr. **Fisher**. I was going to ask you the question about whether we should consider repealing the present laws which make any distinction between men and women who are admitted to West Point in particular. I think that is where the chief provision is found relating to preparation for combat. In other words, is it the view of the gentleman whether at West Point or any of the other academies there should be no restriction whatever in the law as between men and women in regard to their training or preparation for assignment to combat roles?

Mr. **Stratton**. I am not entirely familiar with the law. I believe that as far as the admission to the academies is concerned the only thing it says is that it shall be limited to male citizens of the United States. All you have to do is take out the word male. I don't believe there is anything in there with respect to combat, but there is the prohibition with respect to women serving in the combat zone or in aerial flight, except in the case of Navy nurse, or nurses. I'm sure Army nurses are also admitted into the combat zone. I follow M.A.S.H. pretty regularly on television, and they do serve there; and nurses certainly did serve in the Southwest Pacific with great distinction.

Mr. **Fisher**. I may be thinking of regulations or policies that apply at West Point rather than the law itself.

Mr. **Stratton**. I think that is primarily what it is, Mr. Chairman. When you come to this business about whether men should be treated equally, obviously when these individuals graduate they are selected on the basis of their qualifications. If you have got somebody who is red hot in communications, you are not going to send him off to infantry school. You are going to send him into communications. If you have got a Rickover who is red hot in nuclear power, you are not going to spend too much time training him with the Marines. You are going to let him stay in nuclear power. I think the same thing would be the case with regard to women graduates.

If you have got a Joan of Arc, amazon type maybe, she would like to go into the combat infantry, but there are many other areas where others could serve.

Mr. **Fisher**. In other words, it is your view that there should be no obstruction in the law or in the policies of the various academies that would prevent women from serving in combat, if they should be assigned to that role; is that correct?

Mr. **Stratton**. That is correct, although as I said, I personally would back away from assigning them to actually firing rifles and that kind of thing, the infantry role. I would hesitate to do that. Maybe later on this might be desirable, but it seems to me that there are many combat support roles in the combat zone where they can do an outstanding job.

Mrs. Schroeder has just shown me a letter she got here from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower saying "There is no statute prohibiting the Army from assigning women to combat duty. Army policy excludes women from combat roles."

Mr. **Fisher**. That is what I was thinking about.

Mr. Wilson?

Mr. **Wilson**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stratton, you have said everything that needs to be said. I think it is an outstanding statement. It certainly covers the point very well. I think we overdo this business about combat as you have so strongly emphasized. There are ladies who are qualified to go into combat as you have indicated. We have one in the House from your State, but I think these things all take care of themselves. I think everybody knows who I am talking about.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing else, just to commend the gentleman for his outstanding statement.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Dickinson?

Mr. **Dickinson**. I think it was an outstanding statement from our colleague from New York. I think he really touched all the bases. I think I would disagree with the part of his statement relating to the amount of military training that they get in the academies. I think they are pretty well equipped militarily as well as academically when they come out, certainly more so than the average academic life.

Mr. **Stratton**. There is a lot of close-order drill.

Mr. **Dickinson**. There is close-order drill, with their summer training, with their professors of military science and tactics which pretty well instills in them a knowledge, background, and a history of the military—why wars are fought and how they are fought. I think they come out with more than a passing interest and a knowledge of military procedure and how to fight, but that is really sort of beside the point.

I think the chairman cleared up the only question I had. That is you would advocate that any law that would prohibit a woman from serving in any capacity—that would automatically make her service limited—should be repealed along with the enactment of this bill that would admit them into the academies. So that regardless of what role they might be assigned due to their propensities and aptitudes and so forth, than any legal prohibition should be removed.

Mr. **Stratton**. Yes. That is the prohibition. I think the only one prohibits women from going into the combat zone or into the air except in the case of nurses. I think that should be repealed, yes.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Hillis?

Mr. **Hillis**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I too would like to commend you on your statement, Mr. Stratton. I found it very informative. I would like to just ask a couple of questions.

If you know, how do we get women officers now, other than ROTC? How are women commissioned?

Mr. **Stratton**. I think they are recruited in the ordinary recruiting stations. I noticed that the recruiting office in the post office where I have my office have women recruiters now in an effort to try to attract more women. If somebody comes in who is interested in joining the service, and she has the appropriate qualifications, they probably persuade her to apply for a commission.

Mr. HILLIS. Are we also running some sort of an officer candidate school for women? What I am getting at, are they going through the regular ranks of officer candidates?

Mr. STRATTON. I can only speak with assurance with regard to the Navy. Women are going into the Naval Officers Candidate School in Newport, and I assume that the same thing is true with regard to the Army.

Mr. HILLIS. They are accepting that assignment and the same basic requirements and treatments that the male officer candidate has.

Mr. STRATTON. That is right, and there has been no problem whatsoever. Some people seem to make a great to-do over the fact that maybe women can't chin themselves as many times as men can or do as many pushups, but again I don't think that that is terribly important. They ought to be physically qualified and capable, and apparently this has been worked out in the OCS's and ROTC's without any difficulty at all.

Mr. HILLIS. The point you are making is that this type of thing could be worked out with the physical training systems at the academies, could it not?

Mr. STRATTON. Exactly, yes.

Mr. HILLIS. Without lowering the basic requirements, the admission standards and this sort of thing?

Mr. STRATTON. Exactly. I see no reason why the admission standards should be lowered at all. There is in the academies a test called "physical aptitude." It used to be only a physical exam you had to take. Now there is also a physical aptitude test. This could conceivably be misused to prevent women from qualifying. I think you have got to climb a rope a certain number of feet, for example, and I have had qualified male applicants from my district who were physically in good shape and who were mentally good, but who got knocked out on this physical aptitude. It was alleged that they weren't coordinated, or something of that kind.

I can see how something of that kind could conceivably be used, but I think that ought to be adjusted.

We have women in our police departments now and I guess there is a case over in Fairfax where there is some question as to whether a woman can lift as many pounds as the men are supposed to lift or something of that sort.

Mr. HILLIS. Couldn't we realistically set different physical standards along these lines without discrimination, just based on the differences in physique?

Mr. STRATTON. I don't think we ought to have different physical standards in the sense of being sound of body, but I think the requirement that you do x number of chinups or pushups, and so on, could certainly be adjusted.

When I was a Boy Scout, to get an athletic merit badge you had to jump so many feet, high jump or broad jump, and the bigger the boy you were you had to jump higher or farther. I could never get that badge because I was fat when I was a kid, and with the higher weight, I was supposed to jump farther and higher than I could jump.

I think that kind of thing, something along those lines, would have to be worked out.

Mr. **Hillis**. That is all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mrs. Holt?

Mrs. **Holt**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Stratton. I can't imagine a fat Sam Stratton.

I have to say something, and I guess I shouldn't, but I am concerned about the same consideration that Mr. Hillis has alluded to here. That is the physical aspect. I feel so strongly about the privilege of childbearing I think that that does enter into it. I have some very grave concerns about what is happening to our families today. I know that that doesn't have to have anything to do with it.

I have had a legal career and a political career, and I have three children and three grandchildren and it hasn't interrupted that.

The 5-year period of active duty that a graduate is committed to, do you think that that would have to be changed, if women were admitted to the academy? In other words, would that have to be waived, or do you feel that we would continue the 5-year commitment or 3 years or whatever?

Mr. **Stratton**. I would think that the commitment ought to remain the same as well. There are arrangmeents now, as I understand it, where women in the services who become pregnant are not automatically discharged. Things have gotten to the state now where a woman can be back on the job in what, 3 or 4 weeks, something of that kind, after having a baby.

It would seem to me that, assuming arrangements were there for taking care of the child, that this could be no more than a leave of absence.

Mrs. **Holt**. So you feel that wouldn't change that standard in any way.

Mr. **Stratton**. I wouldn't think that it would need to, no. I feel that the basic requirement should be that we want to get career people. If they are going to go to the service academies for what is a very expensive education, we certainly ought to get performance out of them, but it doesn't always have to be leading an infantry platoon. That is my feeling.

Mrs. **Holt**. Thank you.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Daniel?

Mr. **Daniel**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stratton, I don't recall whether you were here or not when I asked the facetious question of the lady from Colorado.

Mr. **Stratton**. I was.

Mr. **Daniel**. But following that, I did bring up the question about being prepared at the Academies in order that we can assure success of the program. You just mentioned a moment ago something about adjustment in physical standards test.

How long would you suggest that it might be before they could be ready to take the women into the academies, which I think they should, and make sure also that the program was successful?

Mr. **Stratton**. I think this is something that is very simple from my point of view. All we have got to do is tell them to be ready and I think they could be ready to admit women in the next class, 1975. I see no reason for any great pondering. I wouldn't be in favor of having the men and women rooming in the same room, but I don't know why you can't set off one corridor, for example, for women, midshipmen, or cadets. The head could be designated for their use, and that could be done, I would think, in a matter of a couple of weeks.

Mr. DANIEL. You mentioned the adjustments in the physical standards tests. This is something which would have to be taken into account, would it not?

Mr. STRATTON. Yes; but I don't know why it couldn't be done in an afternoon. If you want to delay it, you can think up all kinds of reasons, and we run into that in the Pentagon all the time; but all you have got to do is sit down across a table, and I would think in 10 or 15 minutes you could adjust the tests to meet the situation.

Mr. DANIEL. Usually I agree with the gentleman on 99 percent of his statements. I don't agree on that one. I have had some experience with testing and it hasn't worked that way.

Mr. STRATTON. I may be underestimating some of the problems. If you are interested in trying to admit a qualified woman who could do a job as a pilot, as a solo officer, as a navigator on a ship, I don't know why it would take any more than a week, let's say, to figure out what kind of physical requirements you would need to impose.

Mr. DANIEL. I assure you that I favor the principle, that I think women should be admitted, but I want the program to be successful.

Mr. STRATTON. I do, too, and there is no doubt about the fact that the first few women to be admitted are going to have a rough go, but that was true of the first few women that came to Congress. They have had a rough go sometimes, too, but they have done very well.

Mr. DANIEL. It doesn't apply only to the first few months, I can assure you of that.

Mr. STRATTON. It will apply for the full 4 years, there is no question about that, and I think the girls who are getting into this kind of thing should go in with their eyes open and realize that they are going to be pioneers, and it is undoubtedly going to be a little rough.

Mr. DANIEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Montgomery?

I would like to also thank Mr. Stratton for his very, very strong statement. It is making me do a lot of thinking, Mr. Stratton.

My problem is I really haven't had much experience with women. That is one of my problems. Since I haven't been married, I don't know how they stand up in combat, so I will just have to think it through.

Mr. STRATTON. I had understood you were one of our experts.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Nothing further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Stratton, for clarification let me refer briefly to the comments by Mr. Clements to which you referred in your opening statement.

Among other things, he says this:

> In addition to academic pursuits, the curriculum at the service academies includes training for combat service. Congress has enacted statutes prohibiting women from being assigned to certain combat roles. Under section 6015 of title 10, United States Code, women serving in the Regular Navy and in Regular Marine Corps, are prohibited from being assigned to duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions or from being assigned to duty on vessels of the Navy other than hospital ships and transports. Under section 8549 of title 10, United States Code, female members of the Air Force, other than medical personnel, are prohibited from duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions. So long as these restrictions remain, participation by women in academy training would not be cost effective since the

basic curriculum at the academies is directed toward preparing prospective officers for duty in a combat environment. The mission of the United States Military Academy is primarily to train cadets for careers in the combat arms of the Regular Army. Since the Department of the Army is opposed to women serving in combat, it is opposed to the admission of women to the Military Academy at this time.

My purpose in referring to that is to seek your views about whether the provisions in the U.S. Code which now prohibits women as distinguished from men from certain assignments that might entail combat service, as to whether those things should be repealed, possibly consider doing so in this legislation.

What is your reaction to that?

Mr. STRATTON. I would favor repealing them, Mr. Chairman, and I so responded, I believe, to Mr. Dickinson. I think the only legal bars are the two that he cited—one with respect to the Navy, and one with respect to the Air Force. With respect to the Army, there is no statutory provision. I would favor repealing them.

However, even if they weren't repealed, I would challenge his statement that the training at the academies for women would not be cost effective, because as I have just pointed out, you have got 235 people from the Air Force Academy out of a class of 834 who aren't even going into combat, and I don't anticipate we are going to have more than 3, 4, or 5 women admitted to the opening class. Certainly they could be assigned to those roles and still be cost effective; but I would certainly favor including the repealers of these two statuts that you have referred to in the basic legislation.

Mr. FISHER. While we are on the subject, may I ask Mrs. Schroeder if she shares that view?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I don't think that they are needed in this legislation to allow women to go in. I think that we could repeal them. I think it would be fine to repeal them but I don't think that they are needed to go in.

The other thing that I would like to make a comment on, there were a lot of questions about physical tests in regard to the job that they will be doing in the end. As you know, in the whole personnel field all sorts of entrance tests are now being challenged as to whether or not they really are testing for skills that are required in the job. I think what we are in essence saying is that maybe some of those physical tests are testing for skills that really aren't required in many of the jobs that we are training the people to do so in a way we are setting up an artificial barrier and I think that should be taken into consideration too.

I think we can do it without it.

Mr. FISHER. I recognize that it is not really an essential part of it, but I was going back to the original thought that has been advanced here today, that all discrimination, all differences regarding training and combat between men and women, who are admitted to the academies should be eliminated. For whatever training they get each should be treated precisely alike, and each should be prepared to do the same kind of duties as the others. On that theory, I was wondering if it wouldn't be appropriate for us to explore the propriety—maybe not, it is just a thought—of repealing these provisions which seem to be somewhat in conflict with this concept of quality of treatment by those who are in the military service, whether they be men or women.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think they are probably a little out of date too. I think if we really want to protect women, then we should insist there is only male nurses. We should be consistent. I think when the ERA goes through, they would not be applicable anyway.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, may I make one observation? I think Mrs. Schroeder is correct in what she has to say, provided that we are going to apply the same criteria to all, but if we aren't, in accordance with Mr. Stratton's thinking, then I think we have to take another look, but provided we apply the same standards to everyone, male, female alike, then there is no problem.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think what we are saying is yes, apply the same standards to everyone, I agree, but let's not say the standards are set in cement either. I think his comments about some of the sophomoric things that maybe go on can stand some revision.

Mr. DANIEL. All I am saying is that the standards are uniform.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. But we are not going to make two sets of standards; no.

Mr. WILSON. I would agree with Mr. Stratton that this is an excuse being used by Mr. Clements. I think the simplest thing would be to include in this legislation the sections which prohibit women from participating in combat. Have them eliminated from the law. Then policy can be determined on how women would be best utilized in the event they go into the academies, whether they go into combat or don't go into combat. Anyway, I think it is kind of a moot point if the ERA is ever adopted by a sufficient number of States. I would hope we would have the foresight in the committee to take necessary legislation before it becomes a constitutional right of women to attend, and it would certainly do good for the committee to take that action, I think, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. I think it might not be entirely proper to say this was an excuse advanced by Mr. Clements. He is simply enlightening the committee with what the law is, and the reasoning that prompted the Army to oppose the legislation, which is what we wanted in asking for views, whether we agree with them or not.

I think it is very important that we have all of this information before us and have the benefit of their views in drawing the conclusions they do after considering those things.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is an excuse, and I disagree respectfully with you on that. It seems to me that he is begging the point in that it is not unusual when we pass legislation to have other corrections made where there is a disagreement with other sections of the law or the statutes. This isn't an unusual thing that takes place and obviously there are going to be some other sections that are in conflict with this legislation, in the event that we do consider it seriously and pass it which I hope we do—where we are going to have to bring matters into conformity. There may be a couple of areas where it is necessary to do that.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hogan?

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Stratton, I only have one question for the record. Do you envision as a long time Naval Reserve officer that some day down the road we may have a female commanding officer on one of our major combatant vessels, probably the commanding officer on one of our Trident submarines?

Mr. STRATTON. I don't know why, if she is qualified, that this couldn't happen. Certainly I see no reason why a woman should be excluded from that kind of responsibility.

As I pointed out, we have a woman commander of troops in the Army in Germany at the present time, Obviously there are going to be some problems and adjustments in having women and men serving aboard the same ship. It may take a little while for us to get used to that arrangement, but once we have it. I see no reason why a qualified woman couldn't aspire to command in the same way that a qualified man could.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. May I make a comment, too?

I think one of the problems we have on our ships today is the problem with homosexuality. We don't like to talk about it but it is very evident and all you have to do is talk to some of the officers there. That might help to alleviate that problem. Granted it would create some more but it would help with that. If you want to talk about the Trident, I think the Trident is one of our most important aspects of strategic deterrence. My feeling is it may be the only thing we have left if nuclear holocaust ever came and we had better have women on the ships if that is the only thing left of our civilization, just to preserve our civilization. That would be a very good point.

Mr. HOGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Are there any other questions?

Can you think of any additional contributions either of you can make to this record before we dismiss you?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the Committee has been very fair and I think you have explored virtually all of the points that occur to me. I don't anticipate that this is going to be a simple thing or an easy thing, but I do think that it is something that we should move forward with.

Mr. FISHER. Is it your thought—I haven't given any thought to this at all and made no inquiries—that there will be a necessity for construction of new barracks at these various academies to accommodate the women? Do you envision that as a requirement?

Mr. STRATTON. No; I don't. I see no reason why it should be necessary at all. Mrs. Schroeder said she went to a college where they had coeducation of dorms. This is something that has been going on in my alma mater for some time. You have one floor for men and one floor for women. It jolted me a little bit as a member of the board of trustees when they first instituted it, but this is now pretty much standard procedure around the country, and I would assume that something of the same kind could be done at Bancroft Hall or up in West Point.

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps so. I remember I was at Lackland not long ago inspecting the barracks area there, and the WAFs, the women in the service, a considerable number stationed there, were all in separate barracks or separate apartments.

I would wonder if a comparable procedure would be followed in the Academies. I haven't discussed it with the officials or what the policies or plans may be, but I think that is something the committee will want to explore as to just how that would be handled.

Mr. STRATTON. My feeling is that this is one of the objections that is interposed simply because those who just can't face up to this change want to see the thing in as difficult a light as possible. Maybe eventually, if you get a lot of women, there might be some excuse for setting up a separate building for them, but I see no reason why it needs to be done immediately.

Mr. **Fisher**. I certainly have no strong feelings one way or the other about how these things are handled. Of course in the colleges where you have freedom to choose the place where you live, it is a little different from being sent to a place where, say, you are staying in this barracks over here. I am not making a big issue about it, but I am saying there is a distinction in the private schools and with the military discipline that you have to comply with in the Academies; isn't that correct?

Mrs. **Schroeder**. I think that is correct, but there are a lot of buildings. There are all sorts of alternatives because there is officers' housing and all sorts of things on most of these bases. I am sure with a little imagination, they could handle that problem without any new construction.

Mr. **Fisher**. They might improvise and do some shifting. I don't know, but again that is something we will want to look into. We appreciate your contribution. This is a very good start for the record that we are trying to make.

Mr. **Stratton**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. The committee will recess until Tuesday at 10 o'clock.

[Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Tuesday, June 4, 1974.]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2,
Washington, D.C., Tuesday, June 4, 1974.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m. in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. O. C. Fisher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. FISHER. The committee will come to order and continue receiving testimony today on the admission of women to the service academies.

We will hear first from Congressman du Pont. We welcome you this morning, Congressman. And you may proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. PIERRE S. DU PONT, REPRESENTATIVE FROM DELAWARE

Mr. DU PONT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Pete du Pont, and I am the only Congressman Delaware has. I am here this morning to tell you a little bit about H.R. 10705 of which I am the original sponsor. The purpose of which bill is to allow women to receive an education at the U.S. Military Academies.

In the last decade or so, this country has made tremendous strides in equalizing opportunities for all of its citizens. But there is much which still needs to be done.

One of the most glaring injustices which the Congress can and should eliminate immediately, is the continued prohibition by four of the five military service academies against admitting women.

As you probably know, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy expects to have between 15 and 20 women in their next class beginning on July 16. One of my Academy appointees, Ivy Barton, is slated to be among that group.

However, I have been advised by the Secretaries of the Navy, Air Force, and Army that no matter how well qualified a female service academy applicant from my State or any other State may be, she will not be admitted to the other four service academies.

Discrimination based on sex is clearly wrong and particularly so when it affects one's opportunities for employment.

I believe that the basic elements of fairness as well as the U.S. Constitution guarantee women the right to be admitted to the service academies should they otherwise qualify. As a large contributing sector to the Federal income and funds, it seems odd that women are not able to benefit from and contribute to those very institutions they help to support; no equivalent facilities as extensive in quality and size are available exclusively to women.

Military Academies, themselves, cannot afford to discriminate.

H.R. 10705, of which I am the original sponsor, changes those sections of the United States Code which the military services have used as legal justification for their refusal to admit women.

Women, both officers and enlisted personnel, already play a vital role in the Armed Forces, and that role is expanding rapidly as the military moves toward its goal of an All-Volunteer Service. All three branches of the military intend to substantially increase the number of women in the Armed Forces. By June of 1975, their total objective is to have some 84,000 enlisted women and officers.

However, the restricted admittance shunning female applicants from participating in Military Academies not only handicaps the Academy's potential growth and increased efficiency, but is clearly a case where improvement is thwarted by tradition.

The purpose of the service academies supposedly is to train highly skilled and motivated officers for the Armed Forces who will rise to top leadership positions in the services. Highly motivated and well-qualified persons are needed and sex is irrelevant in meeting that goal.

Competition for service academy appointments would only be enhanced by expanding the eligibility requirements to allow women.

With high demands for manpower in World War II, women's organizations such as the WAAC, WAVES, and SPARS came into existence.

Today it is more than merely reasonable to explore additional changes in service policies to accommodate the admission of women. Some traditionalists—including some members of this committee, I suspect—say we should not forget that the prime business of the armed services is fighting and that combat will remain the male domain. It would remind the traditionalists that there is more to combat in this era than pulling the trigger.

The modern military needs administrators, economists, computer specialists, communications experts, linguists and many other specialists.

Women's role in the armed services is increasing, not only in terms of sheer numbers, but also in terms of occupational and career opportunities available to them.

The first eight women have recently begun service in the National Guard. In the Army, four women have attained the rank of General. Last August, the Air Force appointed a woman as commander of a major U.S. men's military unit.

The Navy plans to open all enlisted ratings to women and ROTC to female midshipmen. They plan to allow women officers to attend the National War College, the Armed Forces Staff College, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. They are revising naval regulations to permit women officers to assume command of naval shore stations and permit women officers to compete with men for promotion, including the rank of admiral. Recently, the Navy graduated its first woman pilot and last year a woman was named a wing commander of an Air Force ROTC unit.

According to former Secretary of Defense Richardson, "All this is simply to underline the fact that we need to make more and better use of women in the services * * * we are not thinking in terms of what we can do for women but what women can do for us, and I am not sure we are asking them to do enough."

I think that sums it up very well. In view of the changing facts on the role of women in the Armed Forces, it is ridiculous, wasteful, and anachronistic to maintain that the best officer training our

Nation has to offer should be limited to men only. The Armed Forces would benefit just as much as women by making these opportunities available to the most qualified candidates of both sexes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher.** Thank you, Mr. du Pont for a very informative statement on this subject.

I gather from your statement that you feel there should be no discrimination in any respect in dealing with women and their admission to and performance in and future service to the country as they apply for admission to these academies; is that correct?

Mr. **du Pont.** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would say that they should have to meet the same standards as male applicants, have to take the same courses, et cetera.

Mr. **Fisher.** I am sure the academies have necessarily maintained certain minimum physical and mental standards which are applicable to all of those who are admitted. And it is your view that if women are admitted they should be required to meet the same standards that the men are required to meet; is that correct?

Mr. **du Pont.** Absolutely.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Daniel?

Mr. **Daniel.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. du Pont, can the committee assume from your statement on page three, "The Modern military needs administrators, economists, computer specialists, communications experts, linguists and many other specialities," can we assume from that that you oppose ground combat roles for women?

In the light of that statement, since you did not mention combat, can we assume you are opposed to ground combat roles?

Mr. **du Pont.** No, sir; I put in my military service in the Navy so that makes me not an expert on the infantry. There are some military commanders who say, for some reason or another, that women would be incapable of performing properly in the infantry. I do not know whether they are right or wrong.

But if they are capable of performing properly there, I would certainly have no objection to having women in the infantry.

Mr. **Daniel.** I commend you on your statement.

Mr. **Fisher.** I think you have made it clear that you feel there should be no restriction in the legislation or in the policies by the various academies with regard to having women who attend made available for combat duty if the occasion arises.

Mr. **du Pont.** Absolutely.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Treen?

Mr. **Treen.** Go ahead. Did we interrupt?

Mr. **du Pont.** I was going to add that I would not in any way argue that requirements should be lowered or that combat descriptions and job descriptions should be changed or anything like that. I think we should stick with the standards we have. But if women meet those standards, they should be allowed into those occupations.

Mr. **Fisher.** Very well.

Mr. Treen?

Mr. **Treen.** If the committee goes along with this, will you promise not to insist on coed dorms?

[Laughter.]

Mr. DU PONT. I would leave a question as technical as that to wiser minds in the military establishment.

Mr. TREEN. That is an excellent answer. I have no further questions.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Montgomery?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. du Pont, on page 3 of your testimony—really just for clarification—you say that the first eight women have recently begun service in the National Guard. Actually, there have been women in the Army National Guard and in the Air Guard Nurse Corps. I assume you are talking about enlisted personnel; is that correct?

Mr. DU PONT. I'm sorry. You are quite correct.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. There is a much larger number now because the Guard Reserve has realized that to make it under the volunteer concept that they will have to turn toward women in the service.

My only other question would be: What percentage do we get of women in the military academies? Do we make it a percentage of what we have in the Nation today eventually, or should it stay a small percentage?

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Montgomery, I would be very strongly opposed to trying to set any quota and trying to say that any fixed percentage must be in the academy. I think that is the wrong approach. I think we should take the best qualified people we can get. If that includes 200 women in a class, if they are the best qualified, fine. If it includes two women, then fine. I do not think we should approach it on a quota basis.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. It is not quite as simple as that. One of my problems which was brought out the other day and which I mentioned in open hearings when we had Mr. Stratton and Mrs. Schroeder was that some of us are having problems getting any applicants for West Point.

My point is do we want to make West Point a women's college. My problem is I am not getting any applications from men to go to West Point. And I could end up with five females going to West Point from my district. Do we want to do that?

Mr. DU PONT. Perhaps your district is different from mine, but I wouldn't mind if there were five females, if they were the best qualified; and if they were better qualified than five males from Delaware, I would think they ought to be admitted ahead of those males.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. My point is that I'm not getting any males.

Thank you.

Mr. FISHER. Mrs. Holt?

Mrs. HOLT. I will defer to Mr. Hillis.

Mr. HILLIS. I want to commend the gentleman on his statement. I find it a very enlightening statement and very much to the point we are dealing with.

I have two or three questions. Does the gentleman feel that—I see you maintain that the Merchant Marine Academy will have 15 to 20 women in the next class—does the gentleman feel there should be any beginning number of women to say go to West Point or to the Air Force Academy? Should it be a group of 20, or 100? How should the program be initiated? Do you have any ideas on that?

Mr. DU PONT. I would think we should look at the applicants.

And, again, as I said to Mr. Montgomery, go back and select however many there are in a class at the Air Force Academy, select the 500 best qualified candidates in the United States. If 20 of those are women, fine. And if two of them are women, fine.

Mr. Hills. The reason I asked the question is the Air Force, I think, is one which has made the suggestion that the program be phased in so that maybe a beginning class of 100 women could be taken and that housing could be provided and courses could be arranged, and so forth. Does the gentleman see this as the approach which we should follow? Or should it just be a small group?

Mr. du Pont. I think any reasonable approach that is adopted by the service academies—if they want to do it in a group of 100 and if that is economically more efficient, that would be fine also, assuming, of course, that there are 100 qualified female applicants. I would not lower the qualifications in order to attract female applicants.

Mr. Hillis. Going to the combat role just a second, certainly, I can see in the Navy and in the Air Force both roles that women can serve that could be very well classed as combat or combat-connected, which generally would not require, say, the physical strength which might be necessary to serve as a crew member for weapons in combat or infantry. I am thinking of such things as a fire direction center on shipboard or radar controller aboard an airbound like AWACS or this type thing. Is there any reason in the world that a woman couldn't perform these functions as well as a man?

Mr. du Pont. I agree with that.

Mr. Fisher. Mrs. Holt?

Mrs. Holt. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. du Pont, thank you for your very comprehensive statement. I am interested in the same question Mr. Hillis asked. We have heard several studies and then General Clarke has said that he feels it should be a large group. I think that will be a difficulty.

Have you had applications from women in your district at this point?

Mr. du Pont. Yes. I have had approximately six. I am guessing now, but I think there were four for the Air Force Academy and two for Annapolis.

Mrs. Holt. So, if we did continue to have that number of applicants, it certainly would work all right. As you have pointed out, women can do things a lot better than most men.

Mr. du Pont. Just to correct the record, I don't believe that statement is anywhere in my testimony.

[Laughter.]

Mrs. Holt. I thought I might get away with that. But I do have this concern that if you have one woman qualify for one academy that that could be a serious problem. And I think General Clarke has expressed that same feeling. You do not think it would?

Mr. du Pont. I can see some mechanical problems in having to revamp the entire Air Force Academy in order to allow one woman to enter. Hopefully, you could get a class somewhat larger than that. But, again, I would not lower the standards to get up to 100. And I wonder if General Clarke isn't proposing that in order to make it more difficult to have women there at all.

Mrs. Holt. Apparently, he is very enthusiastic about it and says he is ready to go and can accept them into the program immediately, but that he feels this would be the optimum condition, to have a class of that size come in.

Thank you. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. Let me ask one question following up on that and then Mr. Dickinson, who just came in, will probably have some questions.

One of the things, Mr. du Pont, which the committee will have to think about is that if a bill is reported when should it become effective. Questions have been raised, as you know, about the availability of the proper quarters at these various Academies for the women when they are brought in.

Would you give us the benefit of your thinking as to whether we should have separate quarters for the women or whether they should use the same barracks which are used by the boys?

Have you given any thought to how that should be arranged? That would have something to do, I would think, with the timeliness of when the law should become effective.

Mr. **du Pont**. I would think you would certainly want separate quarters. I don't see any reason why they couldn't use the same type of barracks the men use.

Mr. **Fisher**. But do you think they should be separate?

Mr. **du Pont**. I would think so.

Mr. **Fisher**. That is precisely what I wanted you to reply.

Mr. Dickinson?

Mr. **Dickinson**. I have no questions.

Mr. **Fisher**. Any other questions? [No response.] Thank you very much.

Mr. **du Pont**. Thank you.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Fascell?

STATEMENT OF HON. DANTE B. FASCELL, REPRESENTATIVE FROM FLORIDA

Mr. **Fascell**. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here. I have a prepared statement which I would ask unanimous consent to submit for the record and take just a moment or two to speak extemporaneously.

I appear in support of the du Pont bill and similar bills for opportunities for women to attend our service academies.

It is beyond question in my mind that we have a resource we are not using, and it is a mistake not to use it to the best possible advantage for the country. Now, all of the problems which arise with respect to the training program, they are real and practical problems. But I assume that the military are real and practical people, and they can solve those problems just as this committee could, if it were in charge of the program.

So having admitted the problems which exist, the principle is still valid and, therefore, ought to be written into law as promptly as possible with whatever contingencies or safeguards or reservations, if any—and I hope there are none—that the committee in its judgment deems necessary in order to carry out the program.

I am through.

Mr. **Fisher**. Thank you.

Mr. Fascell. I just wanted you to know I was seriously supporting the bill, and that is the reason I'm here.

Mr. Fisher. We certainly respect your viewpoint, and without objection, your statement will be included in the record.

[The complete prepared statement of Congressman Dante B. Fascell follows:]

Written Statement of Hon. Dante B. Fascell, Representative From Florida

WOMEN IN MILITARY ACADEMIES

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you in support of H.R. 11276, legislation I joined in sponsoring to insure that each admission to the military service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs. Specifically, of course, the issue is the admission of women to our service academies, and the elimination of the discriminatory admission policy now authorized by law.

At issue is whether we want the best qualified person admitted to our service academies, or whether we want the best qualified male. I say, we need the best qualified person.

H.R. 11276 would eliminate the exception from the prohibition of sex discrimination provisions of the Education Amendments of 1972 which now exists for the service academies. Further, it would bring those sections of the U.S. Code relating to admission requirements at each of the academies in conformance with the non-discrimination policy.

The Congress has repeatedly affirmed that discrimination of any kind, including sex discrimination, is clearly wrong and a violation of basic Constitutional guarantees. The Congress and the federal government must continue the leadership role in breaking down the traditional sex barriers which still deny equal opportunities to women.

The purpose of the service academies is to train highly skilled and motivated officers for the armed forces who will rise to top leadership positions in the services. There is no reason thot young women should not be given the opportunity to have this educational benefit and to then serve as officers in the armed forces. The myth of the weaker sex has long been disproven, and I feel certain that there are many women in this country who could easily withstand the tough physical training undergone by our Army, Navy and Air Force cadets.

Until recently, women have had to pay for their own education and preparation for the armed services. Some progress has been made. The Reserve Officer Training Corps scholarship program has recently been opened to women.

But this is not equality. Women should have the same opportunities as men for the outstanding training available at the service academies. And that means eliminating the current admission restrictions and opening up the academies to qualified women applicants.

The Department of Defense argues that the mission of the service academies is to train officers to fill combat positions, and that women are unsuited for such positions. This argument assumes, first, a need only for combat leadership which assumes a constant and perpetual state of combat—assumptions I find inherently chilling. It also assumes that women are, somehow, not qualified for such responsibilities. The veracity of that assumption is being tested daily.

Women are increasingly proving that they are fully qualified to assume responsibilities formerly considered appropriate only for men. For example, police forces throughout the country are hiring a growing number of women. And those women are not restricted to desk jobs or "meter-maid" roles. They are trained in self defense and criminal apprehension techniques and assigned to patrol duty just as their male counterparts.

Mr. Chairman, the nation's armed forces need the best possible personnel and leadership. Current admission policy effectively excludes half of the nation's potential officers. Not only is such a policy inequitable and discriminatory, but it is not in the best interest of our defense preparedness.

Our service academies provide an excellent—indeed the best—training ground for the future officers on whom our armed forces personnel and policy depend. We must make sure that the most capable and best qualified persons receive that training. And to make sure that happens, we must allow woman applicants to compete for academy appointments.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the Subcommittee to act expeditiously and favorably on legislation which will eliminate the discrimination now permitted in our service academies.

Thank you.

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you.

Mr. FISHER. I assume you follow the pattern of the other three witnesses who have testified in support of bills which they are sponsoring or cosponsoring that there should be no distinction with respect to availability for combat duty on the part of any who attend the academy, including women?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, definitely, very definitely, women ought not to be precluded from combat.

Mr. FISHER. In other words, if we are going to have a law to admit them to the academies then they should be admitted with the understanding and with the proper provision for that.

Mr. FASCELL. They may wind up as a second lieutenant in the mud.

Mr. FISHER. Very well.

Mr. Daniel?

Mr. DANIEL. No questions.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Treen?

Mr. TREEN. No questions.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hillis?

Mr. HILLIS. No questions.

Mr. FISHER. Mrs. Holt?

Mrs. HOLT. No questions.

Mr. FISHER. Very well.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity for a brief appearance in support of the bill.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you.

Mr. Frenzel?

Mr. FRENZEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have submitted a statement, and I request that the statement be printed in the record. I would like to take a minute or 2.

Mr. FISHER. Without objection, the statement will be placed in the record at this point.

[The complete prepared statement of Congressman Bill Frenzel follows:]

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF HON. BILL FRENZEL, REPRESENTATIVE FROM MINNESOTA

Mr. Chairman: Thank you for your willingness to meet on this important subject and for allowing me the opportunity to appear here today in support of admitting women to our Service Academies.

While the thought may be abhorrent to many of our Academy alumni, the time is rapidly approaching when the Academies will have to think female.

My own college, formerly a leading outpost for piggy male chauvinists, has recently been sexually integrated. I wasn't thrilled about it, but despite predictions to the contrary, it may survive. Actually, it seems to be prospering.

In considering this question, I think we should look at equity, at need, and at the existing conditions. Then we should examine the principal objectives.

The point of equity is that if we really intend to open up opportunity for women in our Armed Services—and I do—we can't only open the broom closets, we must open even the inner sanctum, the Academies.

The point of need is that we want the best women, as well as the best men, in our military service. No person of great ability will be encouraged to serve if we deny her, or him, access to the paths of glory. I am a reserve officer. I know, and everybody knows, who gets promoted. Without access to the Academies, women would lack incentives to stay in our Officer Corps.

Present conditions are not reflecting the role women are now playing in the Armed Forces. Women, both officers and enlisted personnel are increasing in numbers, and also in terms of occupational and career opportunities available to them. The Navy is opening all enlisted ratings to women and ROTC to female midshipmen. They also intend to revise naval regulations to permit women line officers to compete with men for promotion, including the rank of admiral. The Air Force has opened all but five combat-associated job specialities to women. Last year, they appointed the first woman commander of a major U.S. men's military unit.

There are many women today already serving as officers in WAVES, WACS, and WAFS. If the military feels that women are qualified to receive commissions and to serve their country as members of a particular branch of service, then it certainly is reasonable that they be entitled to the best officer training facilities in our Nation, our Military Academies. I believe the Armed Forces would benefit as much as the women if these educational opportunities were afforded them.

One of the most cited arguments in opposition to lifting the restrictions is that it is unrealistic to expect women to serve in combat. However, less than 1% of those men eligible for the draft are assigned to combat units. Studies have shown that almost nine out of 10 jobs done in the service are non-combat jobs. There is now, of course, a considerable number of women serving with distinction in the military services, and many of them are serving in combat zones and receiving combat pay. As Senator Marlow Cook has so aptly pointed out, "Combat today may be a lady sitting at a computer at a missile site in North Dakota."

Today, the modern military needs administrators, economists, computer specialists, communication experts, linguists, and many other specialists for careers which do not involve actual hand-to-hand combat. Tomorrow, who knows even whether there will be any combat jobs at all.

Undoubtedly there will be some problems in integrating women into the Academies, but they are not insurmountable ones. As the Chairman of my Air Force Academy Selection Board indicated, someone is going to have to make some changes in the Academy's program. Integrating the woman into the academic phase would be relatively simple. All we need is more space and more teachers, or, we could replace some of the male cadets with female cadets if integrated dormitories are acceptable.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the major benefit of opening the Academies to females would be to increase the competition for appointments. In my District, despite my efforts and those of my Selection Board, we had only a total of 39 applications for all three academies last year. Perhaps, after integration our Academies will experience what our prestigious private male colleges did—an increase in good male applicants and a flock of good female applicants. I would like to see the Committee act favorably on this legislation in the hope that more young people, regardless of sex, can have the advantage of our excellent Military Academy education.

Mr. **Fisher**. We will be pleased to hear your further comments.

STATEMENT OF HON. BILL FRENZEL, REPRESENTATIVE FROM MINNESOTA

Mr. **Frenzel**. Thank you. I want to support the previous speakers and take the same position they have taken. It does seem to me that a point of equity is that if we are going to open up the armed services for women's opportunities, I think we will then have to open up the inner sanctum, which is the military academies, as well as the broom closets.

We have to give them the opportunity we give to anyone else who goes into our armed forces. Like the previous speaker, I think it is important to get the best people. It seems to me that the best women will not want to go into military service unless they have an opportunity to go in the best way, because everybody knows who gets promoted in the military.

Academy graduates are really the hard core and the people who wind up running our military services. Women ought to have a chance for that. They need that chance, or the best of them will not come into the armed services. The question of combat is an interesting one. And I guess basically I feel a little bit like Mr. Fascell does on that.

But I would not object to denying certain designators to women on whatever basis you people think best, because who knows where the combat role is going to fall. Any of us may find ourselves in combat no matter how safe our designator seems to us.

Mr. Chairman, I am a graduate of a college which was formerly all male. And it was a very fine college and is a very fine college. When it decided to integrate sexually, I was not really very thrilled about it and thought it was turning its back on some wonderful traditions.

Yet, the experience of that college and of the other prestigious men's colleges which integrated was that not only did they get some wonderful female applicants, but they got a heck of a lot more wonderful male applicants and in general were able to be a great deal more selective in terms of quality than they had been in the past.

I submit that this is likely to happen in our military academies. I think one of the most important jobs I have as a congressman is to recruit young men now for our military academies. I spend a lot of time and a lot of staff time doing this. But last year for that wonderful education in my large district, which was worked very heavily by me and my staff to elicit applications, we only had 39 young men who applied for our military academies. That is not enough. That education is too good. The opportunity is too good. There should be more. I think if we equalize the opportunity and admit young women then there will indeed be more.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have my written statement serve as the record and would be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. FISHER. Very well, and thank you very much for your statement.

I take it, as the other witnesses who have testified, that you would subscribe to the idea that all who are admitted to these academies, including women, should be prepared and required, if the occasion arises, to meet the same scholastic and physical training requirements that are imposed upon men. There should be no distinction between the two. And if they are admitted, it should be done with that understanding that there will be no distinction, no favoritism because of sex in the curriculum both with regard to the training and to the scholastic and mental tests for requirements which may be imposed.

Does that express your viewpoint?

Mr. FRENZEL. Certainly. It does not mean that if there are some special programs—if you take a guy with weak eyes and make a supply corps officer of him and he goes to the Academy, then you could take a woman with weak eyes and make a supply corps officer out of her, too. As long as it applies equally, I would not mind having qualifications based upon physical situations which might be different within the academy.

Mr. FISHER. But you see no reason to make any difference.

Mr. FRENZEL. I believe there are some young women within my district who would like to apply and I do not think they would want to apply on some kind of a special basis.

Mr. **Fisher.** And they would be prepared to meet the same rigorous training standards and requirements that the boys do who are attending the academies?

Mr. **Frenzel.** I don't see why we shouldn't do it that way, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Daniel?

Mr. **Daniel.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Congressman, have you had any female applicants for the academies?

Mr. **Frenzel.** I have not, but also I have not solicited them. We have always asked for young men only. I have not gone out and tried to recruit some of them. We have had a few inquiries to which we have replied that no, the academies take only males. And while it is my hope that they will eventually take females, I really wouldn't want to accept their applications.

If you were to act this summer or sometime now, I would have female applications next fall.

Mr. **Daniel.** What is your view with respect to getting a substantial number of female applicants? I assume you have talked about this with other Members of Congress and perhaps other people. What is your view on the availability of women for these programs?

Mr. **Frenzel.** I think you could get enough to make a reasonable class in each one of the academies in the first year in which you put the program into effect. If that has to be the fall of 1975—it seems to me that you could get enough. I do not know what enough is. I do not know if it has to be 100 as one of the members of your panel suggested, or 50, or 20 or 200 or whatever. I think you could get that many.

Mr. **Daniel.** Thank you.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Treen, I believe you are next.

Mr. **Treen.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your statement, Congressman Frenzel. And I just want to ask a couple of questions.

If we had to return to a draft in this country to supply our personnel needs, would you favor drafting women?

Mr. **Frenzel.** Yes. I think we probably should.

Mr. **Treen.** I have no other questions.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Montgomery?

Mr. **Montgomery.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Bill, I was noticing on your statement, page 3, you made reference to your district, your selection board. How does that work? Maybe we can pick up some ideas.

Mr. **Frenzel.** I have a group of alumni of each of the military academies and each of those groups forms a selection board which both recruits and interviews candidates for the academies. I mentioned that particular fellow because I think he is alone among the members of my selection board in his enthusiasm about taking women into his academy, the Air Force Academy. Like most of you, I write to all of the principals and counselors at the high schools. We visit the high schools and try to encourage young men to apply for the academies.

In addition, the alumni groups, my selection boards, make personal calls themselves. They are sometimes looking for different people than we are. All those who apply or who look interested go through those selection boards and they make the decisions on who I appoint to the academies.

Mr. **Montgomery.** Thank you.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Hillis?

Mr. **Hillis.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, want to commend the gentleman on his statement. I think it is a very excellent statement. It brings out some points which have not been made before the subcommittee on this important piece of legislation. The gentleman referred to the fact that the college he attended, which I know is a prestigious Eastern school, went coeducational.

What percentage did they strive to reach? Did they go 50–50? One man-one woman, so to speak?

Mr. **Frenzel.** No, Mr. Chairman. They began to accept women's applications and apparently—I am not too familiar with the process—struck some original number that their facilities could handle. They took them, and at this point they are in the position of taking whichever of the men and women are the best candidates. At the moment, because of its tradition, there are still more men applying and apparently more good ones qualifying.

So the ratio is still pretty heavy in favor of men. But they claim to be taking simply the best people who now apply, and they will adapt or put their facilities in such condition that they can take them.

Mr. **Hillis.** The point I am getting at is——

Mr. **Frenzel.** But I think they started with 200, if that's what you're thinking of.

Mr. **Hillis.** Probably in the course of military service, as we know it, the men will still serve predominantly. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. **Frenzel.** It depends on how long the time frame is. I would expect that sometime during my lifetime service would be approximately equal.

Mr. **Hillis.** That is certainly interesting. I perhaps would differ there. I have felt that while the role of the woman is increasing in the military and should increase that the percentage of women—when we talk about 84,000 that is a large number——

Mr. **Frenzel.** I agree.

Now, as you implement this program, if you indeed decide to recommend it, and if it becomes law, I do not think anybody would object to setting some kind of standards initially as to how many you wanted to take in. But I think in the long run you would have great difficulty with a quota system, because the United States does not like a quota system.

In the short run, you could certainly do it, because you would have a physical need to do so, based upon facilities and other considerations.

Mr. **Hillis.** This is the question I guess I was getting to of the gentleman, whether he thought if we start down this path can we limit it based on need or do we have to go 50–50, or something like that?

Mr. **Frenzel.** I think when you start it, you ought to base it on some sort of target that your facilities and your program can meet.

You will recall that Mrs. Green, who I think was here year before last, had an amendment which said that all schools which were trying to integrate or which took both men and women would have to take them on an exactly equal basis, or they would not qualify for certain educational grants.

Congress turned that down and, I think, quite wisely, because they said there are some which are trying to build up to a position of equality, and they just cannot. And if you force them to that position, they will simply take no women. So I think you would be justified in the preliminary stages to set some quotas and do what you can with what you thought were legitimate targets.

Mr. **Hillis**. Those are all the questions I have.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mrs. Holt?

Mrs. **Holt**. I have no questions.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Dickinson?

Mr. **Dickinson**. No questions.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Nedzi?

Mr. **Nedzi**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

One of the things which troubles me in this whole proposal is the problem of physical training. As you probably know, the academies like great emphasis on physical training.

Have you had any kind of experience or have you thought through the problem of getting women who are going to be able to endure the rigors which are demanded physically in the Academy?

I noted in your response to the chairman that you were not advocating lowering the physical standards in any way.

Mr. **Frenzel**. I think I understand the question.

Mr. **Nedzi**. They have running and obstacle courses and all that goes with it which requires a certain physical makeup in order to be able to perform.

Mr. **Frenzel**. I agree with that, Mr. Nedzi. But I may not agree with the standards of the programs which are in effect at the academies. I can see that there can be a very fine physical specimen of a woman who maybe cannot climb over an obstacle course. I think it would be ridiculous to say that she could not get into the Academy because she could not do that.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Except we say it for men now, don't we?

Mr. **Frenzel**. Sure; we used to say a kid couldn't graduate from college until he swam 50 yards, but that really wasn't all that important in the achieving of his degree.

Mr. **Nedzi**. I'm not aware of such a requirement.

Mr. **Frenzel**. We used to have physical education requirements in colleges, too. There were many people who thought they couldn't get their degrees because they couldn't swim.

Mr. **Nedzi**. The question is how do you handle that problem?

Mr. **Frenzel**. I will leave that to you, because you are the committee and you are the smart guys.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Thanks a lot.

Mr. **Frenzel**. But I would say that I don't think the public or the Congress would react very well if we set a lot of silly physical barriers such as pole vaulting 14 feet or crawling through the mud, when you are preparing people for jobs where most of the people who hold those jobs don't have to crawl through the mud.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Are you saying that the present standards are silly?

Mr. **Frenzel**. I don't know, because I do not know what the standards are.

All I know is that if we say we're going to admit women on an equal basis and then have a lot of silly rules which keep women from getting in, I don't think Congress will accept that.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Help me understand what you're saying. Are you saying we need different standards for women?

Mr. **Frenzel**. I don't know. I really don't know. I think that a man or a woman has to be in good shape to get into the Academy, and they ought to be a reasonable physical risk for the Government.

But I'm not sure, in either case, that they should have to do what was required in the old days in terms of physical training.

Mr. **Nedzi**. That is all I have.

Mr. **Fisher**. Let me ask you one to follow up on that just so I will thoroughly understand your views, as best I can.

I know there is some of that which troubles all of us, the very thing you have referred to. But you are saying, as I understand it, that whatever the standards are, training standards, scholastic standards and what have you, after they are once inside the Academy that women should be prepared to meet the same standards that the men meet; is that correct?

Mr. **Frenzel**. Yes, sir, I do say that.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Treen?

Mr. **Treen**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a further question. We have been concentrating on the sex distinction aspect of these bills and I notice of the four bills we have before us that they all state that admission to the academies should be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in the section and without regard to sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of the candidate. Do you support the clause with regard to religious beliefs. It occurs to me that—of course, I am not suggesting that we have discrimination based upon different religions. But we, of course, have recognized for years that conscientious objectors are not required to be in combat.

With the bill as written I think it would prevent us from declining the nomination of one whose religious beliefs would prevent him from going into combat.

Mr. **Frenzel**. I guess I don't think so. I think it means something quite different. I think that if a person's religious beliefs would keep him out of combat, he should not apply. And if he did, you would be perfectly justified in turning him down. I think it means that you won't prefer one group over another.

Mr. **Treen**. In other words, you would support the regulation which would prohibit persons from being admitted to the academy who would refuse to go into combat because of their religious beliefs.

Mr. **Frenzel**. I would.

Mr. **Treen**. Thank you.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Hogan?

Mr. **Hogan**. No, thank you.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Frenzel, you have been very helpful, and we are grateful to you.

The committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

[Whereupon, at 10:50 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned to reconvene at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, June 5, 1974.]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2,
Washington, D.C., Wednesday, June 5, 1974.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m. in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. O. C. Fisher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. FISHER. The committee will come to order.

This morning we have the Honorable Martin R. Hoffmann, General Counsel of the Department of Defense, as the next witness.

Before we begin, let me also welcome General Benade. We are delighted to have you, General. We always are. We are always a little better informed after you speak.

So today we will proceed with the testimony relating to the bill concerning the admission of women to the service academies, and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN R. HOFFMANN, GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. HOFFMANN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. General Benade and I are delighted to have this opportunity to appear before the committee to present the views of the department relating to the appointment and admission of women to the service academies.

As you know, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Uniformed Chiefs, along with the superintendents of the three service academies will follow at later sessions to give more detailed views based on the experience and the objectives of the services in creating and maintaining the academies.

As the subcommittee is aware, there is litigation pending in the District Court for the District of Columbia that touches upon the issues under discussion today. As a preface to the views of the Department, I believe it will be constructive to acquaint you with the status of these cases.

Two lawsuits were filed on September 26, 1973, in the U.S. District Court, District of Columbia, *Waldie* v. *Schlesinger*, which is the case whose object is the admission to the Naval Academy, and *Edwards* v. *Schlesinger*, which deals with the Air Force Academy.

The plaintiffs in both of these cases seek a permanent injunction to require the Department of Defense to process and admit qualified female applicants to those academies. They also seek a declaratory judgment that the refusal of the Departments of the Navy and Air Force to process the applications of female applicants deprives the applicants of their equal rights in training, employment, and career advancement in the military, and thereby illegally frustrates the plaintiff-Congressmen from exercising in a nondiscriminatory fashion their statutory authority to nominate persons to the academies.

More specifically, it is alleged in these lawsuits that refusal to admit women to the academies denies plaintiffs their right to equal protection guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution; that the statutes governing admission of women to the academies do not preclude women from being admitted; that the admission of women is consistent with the official purpose of the academies, which plaintiffs state is to train professional career officers in many fields, and not just for the combat arms; and finally that exclusion of women from the academies deprives them of valuable educational, employment, and career advantages available only to graduates of the Academies.

The answers to the complaints were filed by the Government on January 9, 1974. The Government on April 29, 1974, moved for summary judgment, supported by affidavits. The plaintiffs opposed the motion on May 15, 1974, and with the filing of a Defense reply on May 28, 1974, the case is now ripe for decision by that court.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that oral arguments in this case were conducted last evening in the district court.

The Government's position in this litigation is that the exclusion of women from the academies is not an unconstitutional discrimination on the basis of sex. The differentiation between the sexes is held to have a rational basis in legitimate Government purpose, so that under the governing case-law, as it presently stands, it does not constitute a denial of equal protection under the fifth amendment.

Second, the government asserts that the statutes governing admission of women to the academies preclude the services from admitting women. The affidavits and pleadings assert that the women are not denied educational, employment, or career opportunities in the Armed Forces by virtue of their exclusion from the academies.

Finally, the services show that the statutory prohibitions against the use of women in combat strongly militate against a policy of admission to the academies since the academies have as their primary function the training of officers for combat duty. I will be happy to respond to particular questions on this litigation if the subcommittee so desires.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that I had hoped to have with me, to provide for the staff, a complete set of the pleadings in these cases. They are quite voluminous and I am not quite sure you would want to include them in your hearing record. I think there is a good deal of research on a lot of the legal and policy issues which have gone into the lawsuit. Accordingly, it might be helpful to the committee staff. We will get that to you. [Retained in committee files.]

Mr. FISHER. I think the staff could profit from reading the pleadings, if they are available.

Mr. HOFFMANN. Yes, sir.

Over the past few years anumber of legislative proposals have been introduced in the Congress which have as their object the admission of women to the service academies. H.R. 9832, 93d Congress, a bill "To eliminate discrimination based on sex with respect to the appointment and admission of women to the service academies" is one such measure. The Department reported its opposition to this bill to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services on April 26, 1974. As the Department of Defense stated in its report on that measure, there is a great demand for the services of graduates of the three service academies. Therefore, great care must be exercised in the selection of individuals to attend service academies so that the Army, Navy, and Air Force will be able to assign graduates to those areas where the need is most critical.

Over and above the immediate problems inherent in consideration of the bills proposing admission of women to the academies, as I am sure the subcommittee has already perceived from these hearings to date, there are a number of constitutional considerations and considerations of fairness involved in the establishment of either identical or disparate combat roles for men and women in the services.

Let me state quite clearly the Department's affirmative position with respect to the role of women in the services. As this subcommittee knows, the Department has undertaken a concerted effort to bring more women into the Services both in enlisted and officer roles. It is the goal of the Department of Defense to obtain the best qualified people for military service and to utilize them in skills best suited for their aptitudes. The DOD policy of increasing the number of women recruited and increasing the number of career fields open to them assists in recruiting qualified military personnel in the all-volunteer environment as well as supports the national policy of providing equal opportunity to women.

In this regard, the military services plan to increase the number of female military personnel from 55,400 at the end of fiscal year 1973 to 93,500 by the end of fiscal year 1975. Enlisted women strength during the same period is expected to almost double from 42,600 to 79,400 and will continue to expand during fiscal year 1976–78.

The demonstrated contribution of women in the services is a source of pride to our Nation and particularly to the Department. We look forward to their continued service in important and vital military roles. There are alternative training sources for female officers that offer excellent educational opportunities. These are alternative training sources to the academy.

The opening of the Reserve Officers Training Corps scholarship program to women is an example of this new emphasis. Through this program, young women may acquire their college education and military training at schools having coeducational facilities and offering the flexibility of courses to meet both their needs and the needs of the respective services. The currently available procurement sources produce all of the female officers required by the armed services and provide a wide range of choice for the female applicant.

The Department of Defense agency responsible for establishing policy in regard to the service academies is the Department of Defense Committee on Excellence in Education. This Committee is chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Clements. The members are the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force. This Committee affords executive examination and overview of all the education programs of the Department and exercises management control over the creation, operation, and termination of the various elements of these programs.

The Department of Defense Committee on Excellence in Education has reaffirmed that the indispensable function of the three service academies is now the same as it always has been: To teach the skills and inculcate the values which form the bedrock of this Nation's combat leadership.

At the Navy Academy, to cite an example, the curriculum is designed to train men for duty at sea by developing in them a solid foundation for seagoing skills. Similarly, the primary function of the Military Academy and Air Force Academy is to produce career-oriented officers qualified to provide combat qualified leadership to carry out their mission.

It is of concomitant importance that current enrollment policies be maintained so that those entering the academies are qualified to be future combat leaders. The unicity of the rigorous training program required of all of the cadets, imbedded in a combat-oriented environment which presumes that every cadet or midshipman is a potential combat leader, is a cornerstone of the service academies as they are presently constituted. The services will be prepared to speak in detail to this concept and its preeminence in the context of overall service education.

Mr. Chairman, let me add a note of interest with respect to the Defense Committee on Excellence in Education. That Committee has this year travelled and conducted meetings and reviewed the status of each of the service academies at their locations, this is a point which may amplify for you what the weight of their recommendations, which I have just given.

The Department believes that the will of the American people, as expressed in existing laws and demonstrated by national policy in past wars, has always been and continues to be that women should not serve in combat leadership roles.

Congress has enacted statutes prohibiting women from being assigned to certain combat roles in the Navy and Air Force. Under section 6015, title 10, United States Code, women serving in the Navy and the Marine Corps are prohibited from being assigned to duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions or from being assigned to duty on vessels of the Navy other than hospital ships and transports.

Under section 8549 of title 10, United States Code, female members of the Air Force are generally prohibited from duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions. This policy is further reflected by Army regulations, which, since the time of the Revolution, has included only male officers in service in combat roles.

So long as the essential mission and purpose of the service academies is to provide the Armed Forces with the hard core of combat leaders, we think it plain that the framing of the service academies' appointment and admission criteria, in terms of combat qualifications, serves rational, legitimate and compelling governmental interests. So long as the historical and legal restrictions against women serving in combat roles continue, it is clear that this differentiation based on sex bears a fair and substantial relationship to the accomplishment of the governmental interests here involved and, thus, to the appointment and admission standards through which those interests are fulfilled.

In view of the fact that women are precluded from serving in combat, to admit them to the service academies would alter the fundamental character of the institutions as training grounds for combat-leadership officers.

There are numerous roles beyond those in the combat field which are vital to the effectiveness and efficiency of our armed forces, particularly given the highly complex nature of modern warfare. Competence in these areas is no less important than in the combat fields. The Services are continually striving to insure that the career opportunities of noncombat officers are truly equal to those in the combat fields.

The Department of Defense believes that existing laws do, and should, prohibit the use of women in combat units. We must recognize that combat personnel face the risk of capture by an armed enemy to a much greater degree than do other members of the Armed Forces. It is well to note that no other major nation of the world routinely uses women in combat roles. We believe the combat elements of the Armed Forces of the United States should be limited to men trained for that purpose.

Let me assure this subcommittee, however, if it comes to be the judgment of the American people as expressed through their elected representatives that women should fill combat leadership roles in our Armed Forces, we in the Department of Defense will implement that judgment. Unless or until that judgment is made, the Department of Defense believes the policy sound that only males be admitted to the Nation's service academies.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, let me make in addition to these remarks further remarks in two general categories. First, addressing the whole question of litigation which is now pending, I think the subcommittee can see that the issues presented there are substantially narrower than the issues which are presented to you.

In addition to the fact that the combat question is not addressed at any point by the plaintiffs in that case, they have adopted a position which has evolved through the litigation that they seem to recognize a reason to limit the number of women who would attend the academies to a fairly small number.

I think they have not drawn the laws and the criteria in the laws relating to the admission of women to the academies and the processing thereof into constitutional argument. They have specifically refused to do that. Their argument is that those statutes must be construed to allow women into the academies, as they presently stand.

So I think one must be careful not to assume that the courts have before them a means whereby to resolve the problems should one decide it is strictly a matter of constitutional law. We do not believe it is.

The second general area to which I might address a few remarks as a follow-on to my statement is the issue of combat and its relationship to the academies.

Now as I have spelled out in my statement, legitimate Government purpose constitutes a rational basis for making a differentiation in sex. If the decision is that women should go into combat and that they should be trained therefor in the service academies, then, of course, there is no constitutional issue.

There would be no way of setting a quota on the number of women for this purpose in our judgment, since that would be a distinction between men and women not related to the rational Government purpose.

Should the committee decide to enact legislation which would admit women to the academies but not change the strictures against combat participation by women, then you would have a situation which in my judgment would allow you to set a quota on combat officers, since there would be a rational basis.

You would be precluded from setting a quota on noncombat or general support type personnel by reason of the fact that a differentiation between the sexes on other than a combat basis would not have the rational basis necessary to withstand the constitutional test.

So under the present laws and the constitution as it is interpreted by the courts, the thrust of what I'm saying is that the decision to admit women to the academies—if it should go forward—is deserving of the attention of both the Congress and the Department as to questions of the numbers and facilities and on these sorts of practical problems which will have an effect on the character of the academies and therefore the character of the entire training structure of the services as we know it today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. Thank you, Mr. Hoffmann.

Is there any question in your mind about the constitutionality of the policies followed, as I understand them, at West Point today and to some extent, but maybe not so well defined, at other academies which require all those who take the training at the Academy to commit themselves to combat roles in the event they should be called for that purpose?

Is it your belief that the Government has the right, in carrying out the functions of those academies, to require those who participate in the training there to engage in combat missions in the event they should be called or assigned for that purpose?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. Yes, sir. I think the answer to both of those questions is yes.

It is my opinion that the differentiation in the sexes based upon the combat role is constitutional. And it is further my judgment that the laws requiring the exaction of a commitment to combat service after completion of the Academy courses are also constitutional.

Mr. **Fisher**. And you base that upon the principle of rationality which you referred to? In other words, the distinction between men and women being in combat is a rational distinction? That is the way I understand your testimony.

Mr. **Hoffmann**. I believe it is, and I think it is reinforced by the successive congressional actions and inactions which have put the law in its present state. These occur not only in the prohibitions against combat to which I have adverted, but I think the history of the legislative development of the academies would require this view.

I do not believe a bill addressing this particular subject was introduced into the Congress before the second section of the 92d Congress. There was a bill introduced in 1945 by Mr. Fulton which would have set up a triservice academy for female officer candidates.

There following, during the debate on the Air Force Academy bill, it is very clear from debate on this bill, again carried on by Mr. Fulton, that there was no objective by the Congress at that time to have women in the Air Force Academy.

During the debate Mr. Fulton took time out with Mr. Short to explore the possibilities of consideration of his proposal to have an all-service academy. I think that is the law as it stands today. But we hold it clear that there is legitimate Government purpose as expressed in the statutes by the Congress and that this is fully expressed in the legislative history of the institutions.

Mr. Fisher. One other question. You referred to the existing statutes which prohibit the assignment of women to certain combat roles in the Navy and the Air Force.

In the event the committee should report a bill requiring the admission of women to the service academies, I would assume that—and it has been so testified by the sponsors of the legislation—I would assume that those women would go in with the understanding that they would comply with the regulations which would require them to accept combat missions in the event they should be called upon to do so.

Now just assuming that the committee should proceed in that direction, is it your thought that at the same time we should repeal these statutes which you refer to which now prohibit combat roles for women in the Navy and in the Air Force?

Mr. Hoffmann. I think those are two separate questions, Mr. Chairman.

As I have indicated, I think the committee could take the course of changing the admission requirements for the academies without addressing the combat issue. In my view, if that were done, it should be made clear that is what is being done. That would enforce the series of decisions which I mentioned having to do with splitting the academies to some extent in half. There would be no percentage in requiring all admittants to participate fully in the combat training required. And there may be some positive arguments for not doing that in order to preserve the unicity of academy and the combat leadership training and experience to which I have adverted.

But assuming the Congress decided that it was the better part of wisdom to admit women to the academies. I think probably that next question should be addressed, the question as to combat. And when you get to the question of combat, you are talking about now not only officers, but you are talking about enlisted personnel.

This, of course, while it could be arguable tangential to the issue at hand, does raise the question of whether, if you remove the combat restructions, whether you would then not fully accommodate both males and females in all units of the service with respect to the combat mission.

And I think that is the large question. The Department of Defense view is that neither should be changed. The restriction against combat, we believe, reflects the will of the American people on the issue. And we further believe that the academies should remain structured the way they are.

Mr. Fisher. Just to summarize the basis for your conclusions, as I understand them, the Department of Defense opposes this legislation because it takes the position that the academies are primarily intended to train the cadets and the midshipmen for combat roles if they are called upon to perform in that regard.

And because you feel that women are not properly qualified, for the reasons you set forth, to engage in combat roles is the basis for your opposition to this legislation; is that correct?

Mr. Hoffmann. That is correct.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Nedzi?

Mr. **Nedzi**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Hoffmann**, on page 4 you stated that the military services plan to increase the number of females in the military from 54,000 up to 93,000. Could you tell us what goes into making that kind of plan?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. I will ask General Benade to address himself to the particulars.

I think it is a blend of policy and practical considerations. As I have indicated, a number of career fields, as they evolve and as the military review them, are opening up. We see applications from highly qualified women for spots.

Moreover, as we project manpower figures and in our desire to get the most qualified applicants to fill these jobs, I think it is increasingly clear that as the services take in women and as the women become more open to the idea of the service career that there are just more possibilities on both sides.

General, can you add to that?

General **Benade**. I think in large part, Mr. Nedzi, the reason for the expansion is the fact that just about all—in fact all of the fields in the military services, all four services, which are not strictly combat or immediate combat support have been opened up to women. This considerably expands prior concepts of utilization of women. Therefore, these numbers can be accommodated within the structure.

Mr. **Nedzi**. What percentage of the spots in the military would you say presently could be made available to women?

General **Benade**. In terms of numbers?

Mr. **Nedzi**. Yes.

General **Benade**. Well, as I say, these numbers indicate that all the way up to almost 100,000 will ultimately be used—that is, women who can be accommodated within the services.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Certainly, more than 100,000 are utilized in noncombat roles within the military, aren't they?

General **Benade**. Yes, Mr. Nedzi. But always you have the problem that there has to be a balance, because in the noncombat units you still have to have a rotation base. You still have the problem of which position should be filled by civilians. All of these factors are taken into account.

There was, as you recall, in the manpower portion of the authorization hearings—the Department of Defense submitted to the Congress and, specifically, to this Committee, the manpower requirements report.

I have before me that report, section 12 of that report goes into considerable detail on this subject we are discussing. It lays out the career fields now open to women.

You will see a considerable expansion of those fields.

Mr. **Nedzi**. For present purposes, can you give us some idea of how many spots there are which are not involved in the rotation base with respect to combat? Certainly, substantially more than 100,000 would be.

General **Benade**. A very rough aggregation, Mr. Nedzi, would be that about 54 percent of the armed forces are in combat units or direct combat skills, a little more than half.

In the support base about 46 percent.

Mr. Nedzi. Something in excess of 1 million?

General Benade. Yes.

Mr. Nedzi. And then my question is how do you arrive at the 93,500 figure?

General Benade. Other factors come into it. First is the matter of facilities for their training and housing and so on. There has been a problem with respect to providing adequate facilities for women in the Army, for example.

This has required some expansion of the facilities at Fort McClellan, additional housing to be provided of the proper kind. It is a phase-in type thing, and the accession of the women is related to the capability of the services to properly house and train them.

Mr. Nedzi. What about recruitment?

General Benade. No problem with respect to recruitment, Mr. Nedzi. As you know, I am sure, we have enjoyed outstanding success in the recruiting of women both in the enlisted area and the officer area. The standards are very high and the quality of the intake is outstanding.

Mr. Nedzi. So the problem right now is merely—I should not say "merely," because it is substantial—but essentially it is the question of housing and providing physical facilities for the individuals, rather than getting them to enlist?

General Benade. That is correct, sir.

Ideally, Mr. Nedzi, there is an optimum mix between the number of military, including women in the military, and the number of civilians needed to perform the defense mission.

One of the great problems we have in all of the services—and the Navy is an outstanding example—is the matter of insuring in the structure sufficient spaces for the rotation of the individuals from the ships at sea to billets on shore, for example.

The billets on shore in the continental United States generally are not considered to be combat units. Yet it is necessary to have vacancies in those billets to accommodate the men who come in off the ships at sea. If women were in those billets there would be adequate rotation base for the men.

Mr. Nedzi. Of course, the Navy is the smallest component of the military, outside of the Marine Corps.

General Benade. Yes, sir, but they have such a large proportion of their forces at sea at any one time.

Mr. Nedzi. Have you arrived at the optimum mix to which you referred, between males and females in the service?

General Benade. This is continually under study in all of the services and in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Nedzi.

I, as purely a personal opinion, would expect we would continue to see some further enlargement, although not quite so dramatic, in future years. But I do not think we have reached the optimum blend yet of the military-civilian-women mix for the Armed Forces.

Mr. Nedzi. Could you give us a ball park estimate as to what an optimum mix of males and females is?

General Benade. I do not believe I can, Mr. Nedzi, because it does involve some very intricate calculations and examinations of duties. I think I might mislead more than I would help, if I tried to do it.

Mr. NEDZI. Offhand, do you see any problem in having a 50-50 mix?

General BENADE. Yes, I would definitely see very great problems if we had a mix that large, unless women were fully prepared to assume and perform in combat roles.

Mr. NEDZI. I am talking about the 46 percent having no combat connection.

General BENADE. But I'm driving at the fact that a large part of that 46 percent—the spaces are used by people who rotate from the fleet and the combat units overseas.

Mr. NEDZI. Can you give us a figure as to what percentage we have in the military which is not involved in that combat mix, that rotation base?

General BENADE. It will vary by service, but I can give you some rough idea. If we were to speak in terms purely of combat skills, it would range from perhaps 15 or 16 percent in the purely combat MOS's of the Army, to as high as about 38 percent for the combat skills in the Air Force.

Mr. NEDZI. I assume that is the 54 percent you were talking about across the board?

General BENADE. It is included, and that would be a more refined breakdown, Mr. Nedzi. That would be the proportion of the force which is engaged in roles which would require them to come into direct contact with the enemy.

Mr. NEDZI. I am concerned about the 46 percent. How many of those are actually used as a rotation base? What percentage is purely noncombat with the possibility of going into combat next to being nonexistent? And there are such areas; are there not?

General BENADE. Yes, Mr. Nedzi.

I think the best way I can answer that question, sir, is to indicate that about that whole 46 percent would be considered as in jobs not involving direct combat. But again I emphasize that of that 46 percent a large part forms part of the rotation base.

Mr. NEDZI. How much of that?

General BENADE. I would say the largest part of it, but I cannot give you a precise figure.

Mr. NEDZI. OK.

Mr. Hoffmann, I noted that the ROTC is open to women. Have you made any accommodations in the program to provide the kind of training for women officers which you think is appropriate?

Mr. HOFFMANN. The ROTC's have in fact been opened up, the first one in 1968, which was in the Air Force. And both the Army and the Navy are, I think this year, admitting their first ROTC female candidates on other than a trial basis.

The courses as structured and the inputs to those courses are designed for the female applicant. We have had some experience with that. There were test programs I believe in both the Navy and the Army. And, of course, we have the experience over a number of years of female officers to draw on.

So I would say, yes, those ROTC courses are well suited for this purpose.

Mr. NEDZI. Why couldn't the same thing be done in the Academies?

Mr. HOFFMANN. I think the same thing probably could be done at the Academies. We feel that to do that will change the essential nature of the Academies and the essential character of the training that you can conduct at the Academies.

Mr. **Nedzi.** Is that undesirable?

Mr. **Hoffmann.** We think it is, yes.

Mr. **Nedzi.** Why?

Mr. **Hoffmann.** Basically, two reasons. First, you have a wide range of schools and opportunities at the level where officers come in and receive their primary training, which are already open to women. So there is not a need for additional facilities. Of course, beyond that you have what amounts to graduate schools in all of the services, most of those not having the particular combat qualification requirements, are open to and attended by women.

Secondly, you do have a requirement, it seems to me, for a certain kind of school to give you the hardcore backbone of combat-oriented leadership. I think that history has demonstrated, certainly with respect to the Army and Naval Academies, that this is necessary. Our position is that this sort of training which becomes more at a premium as we get farther away from the actual combat experience itself, which hopefully in a generation of peace we will continue to do, there are the types of skills, the types of tolerance and types of leadership ability which, as these programs have evolved over the course of a number of years, have proved to be not only valuable but indispensable in combat. We feel that you have to have that input, and this is the best way to get it. Now, we are not saying it is impossible to do it. We are saying it is unwise to do it. And for the reason we do not propose to send women to combat, this is not the time to do it.

Mr. **Nedzi.** Why do you say it is unwise to do it? And it really gets down to the question as to why you believe—because I noted in your statement that you said that the DOD believes that existing laws prohibit the use of women in combat units, and the words, "* * * and they should prohibit the use of women in combat units," are used. And my question is: Why should these laws prohibit the use of women in combat?

Mr. **Hoffmann.** I think because the American people and the American ethos, if you will, while it has changed over the course of the history of the country, has not changed to that degree.

If you look at specific examples——

Mr. **Nedzi.** Should we be exerting some effort to change the American ethos in that respect?

Mr. **Hoffmann.** I think we certainly should. And as my statement indicates, the advances taken by the services and the DOD in the admission of women to the services have gone a long way in that direction.

I do not believe, and the Department of Defense does not believe, we have yet come to the time when we are prepared to make no distinction in combat between two persons, one of which is a male and one a female.

Mr. **Nedzi.** Help me understand that more clearly. Why? I mean, apart from the fact that the laws say they should not be used. We are here in the process of changing laws, as you know, possibly changing the law, and we need guidance.

Mr. **Hoffmann.** There is certainly no question that there is nothing—Senator Dirksen used to say there is nothing more supportive of the enactment of legislation than an idea whose time has come. We question whether the time has come.

Take, for instance, the question of capture of women. Now, there is no question that when you are opposed to a foe as we were in Vietnam, for instance, or as we were in Korea, or as we have been perceived to have been in other wars where the opposing side does not have the reverence for women and does not hold them in the esteem that our society does, that the capture of women and the resultant political advantage gained by the captors, in the minds of the people, will be significantly different from what it would be in the case of men.

Mr. NEDZI. I mean, you get stories about how our male prisoners were poorly treated.

Mr. HOFFMANN. I agree with you, and I think given the American ethos, as it exists today, the situation would be far worse with respect to female captives. That, of course, affects the national will to maintain combat. And I think that is a relevant point.

The question of the exposure of women to the rigors and to the experience of combat, the interdependence required, there is a question as to whether—whether it is right or wrong or whether it is as we wish it would be in a perfect world—women are regarded as being as combat worthy as men.

Mr. NEDZI. You seem to be falling back upon the attitude of the public. I just wonder whether all of us do not have some obligation to lead in this regard. Is it your feeling that we should continue to prohibit the use of women in combat units, or should we change and allow women into combat?

Mr. HOFFMANN. It is the feeling of the Department that we should continue the prohibition.

Mr. NEDZI. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Daniel?

Mr. DANIEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Benade, Mr. Nedzi referred to the availability of women in all of the military forces. Has DOD conducted any studies, or has anyone else, to your knowledge, or made any projections, as to the number of women who might have an interest in applying to the Military Academies?

General BENADE. No, sir. I do not believe there is available any clear indication as to what that number might be.

Mr. DANIEL. So far as you know, there have been no studies made?

General BENADE. I am not aware of any.

Mr. DANIEL. What is your own personal opinion?

General BENADE. My personal opinion, Mr. Daniel, is that the number of women who would elect admission to the Academy, as opposed to the other avenues open to them, like the 4-year scholarship programs and so on, would be relatively small, I would think.

Yet I would go on to say that if the Congress were to direct that women be admitted to the Academies, then hopefully the number of applicants will be on the order of five or six for every one to be admitted, in order to permit the same degree of selectivity which is now employed in the selection of the young men who enter.

Mr. DANIEL. In the event the law is changed, would that be a desirable number from your point of view, from a cost standpoint, for example, or any other standpoint, for that matter. For example, would you say that you could make 100 more cost effective than 10? Will you address that question?

General **Benade**. I think, Mr. Daniel, as a general proposition, that if you were to have women enter the academies at some point then the numbers should be sufficient, I would think, to make it worthwhile in terms of the changes which will presumably have to be made in terms of the curriculum, physical training, such changes in the physical facilities as might be required to provide for the necessary privacy for the women cadets and so on. I think purely from a cost effectiveness standpoint that if you are going to undertake those changes you are better off to make them for some larger number than a small number. Otherwise, you have gone to a great deal of expense with very little advantage.

Mr. **Hoffmann**. Let me, if I may, add to that answer. If the pattern the Congress chooses is to lift the restrictions on women in combat, then the problem disappears. You simply admit, without regard to quotas. You would have as many in each class as could qualify under the qualifications requirements in competition with the others.

And as a practical matter, before you get to class you really do not know how many will be there.

If you do not lift the combat restriction but you do provide for the admission of females to the academies, then you have another problem which may or may not be subject to constitutional resolution in terms of a quota system. So that whether one might hazard guesses as to how the academies would like to handle the problem, if you gave it to them—they can respond in terms of numbers, I think, better than we—it is not clear that the number will be an operative part of our equation.

Mr. **Daniel**. Let the record show that I am not suggesting quotas, but I am simply asking how can you best handle it in the event the law is changed.

If I understand the proponents of these bills, they do not want any change in the curriculum nor in the physical standards, so that problem would not be as severe if we operate under the standards which are being recommended by the proponents of this legislation.

In case the prohibition against women serving in combat roles is removed, what are the real serious problems? Let us assume we are going to repeal the law which says that women cannot serve in combat, what are the serious problems with respect to the admission of women to the academies?

General **Benade**. There would be no serious problems which would remain, unless I am misunderstanding the question. Once that declaration of national policy has been made and embodied in the statutes, then, as Mr. Hoffmann has indicated, the number of women to be admitted to the academies would be without limit. And it would be on a best qualified basis.

Now what this does subsequently in terms of the composition of combat forces and how this might affect combat capability are very deep questions which I would rather not give an off the top of the head answer to, Mr. Daniel.

Mr. **Daniel**. Of course.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **Daniel**. Yes.

Mr. **Nedzi.** I just had drawn to my attention that there is no law preventing women from serving in combat as far as the Army is concerned.

General **Benade.** That is correct, Mr Nedzi. But they have by policy continuously, from the beginning of their existence, had the same effect.

Mr. **Nedzi.** In view of the fact that the law does not prohibit you from having women serve in combat, why shouldn't they be admitted to the Military Academy?

General **Benade.** For the reasons which have been adduced this morning. The role of West Point has been considered to be that of producing combat leaders. And since Army policy has, during all of its history, been to exclude women from combat units, they have, therefore, not been eligible for admission to West Point.

Mr. **Nedzi.** Who makes Army policy?

General **Benade.** The Secretary of the Army with the approval of the Secretary of Defense and the President.

Mr. **Nedzi.** Why shouldn't he change it?

Mr. **Hoffmann.** I think the answer to that is for the reason that he doesn't believe it should be changed.

Mr. **Nedzi.** But not because of any legal restriction?

Mr. **Hoffman.** I do not think there is a legal restriction necessarily with respect to the Army which could not be cured by the Army, if it wanted to.

Mr. **Nedzi.** I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. **Daniel.** In light of the questions propounded by Mr. Nedzi, would you differentiate between the academies with respect to the admission of women? Are there any problems at one which you would not have at another?

General **Benade.** That is possible, Mr. Daniel. But might I suggest that it is my understanding that of the future witnesses to appear before the committee there will appear the respective superintendents of the academies. I am sure they will be much more qualified to address how it will affect their specific institutions.

Mr. **Daniel.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Treen?

Mr. **Treen.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hoffmann, did I understand you to say that the plaintiffs in the two suits you mentioned are not alleging the unconstitutionality of the statutes involved? They are not arguing that point?

Mr. **Hoffmann.** That is correct. They have not argued it. Their argument is based upon the policy, but their argument on briefs is that the statutes are neutral.

Mr. **Treen.** Is it your view—do you construe the statutes as imposing a prohibition to the admission of women to the academies?

Mr. **Hoffmann.** Yes, sir. We do so regard the statutes.

Mr. **Treen.** And yet they are not arguing that these statutes ar constitutionally invalid?

Mr. **Hoffmann.** They have not taken that position in court.

Mr. **Treen.** I understand—and correct me if I am wrong—that the Air Force Academy permits a certain percentage of men into the academy who cannot qualify as pilots because of their eyesight. I have a vague recollection it is in the neighborhood of 5 or 7 percent or something like that. But is it 25 percent?

First of all, do you know what the percentage is who are admitted to the Air Force Academy and who, when they are admitted, know that they will not be assigned as pilots?

Mr. HOFFMANN. Yes.

Mr. TREEN. What percentage is it?

Mr. HOFFMANN. I will have to get you the percentage. I believe it may be in the vicinity of 25 percent.

[The following information was received for the record:]

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1974.

Mr. WILLIAM H. HOGAN, Jr.,
Counsel, Armed Services Committee Staff,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOGAN: In response to Mr. Treen's questions on pages 139–140 regarding the percentage of individuals admitted to the Air Force Academy who cannot qualify as pilots, the following information is supplied. The following table indicates for each of the last 10 years the percentage of the entering class to the Air Force Academy who were not qualified for pilot or navigation training:

Class:	*Percent nonflying qualified*
1968	20.5
1969	12.9
1970	15.2
1971	13.6
1972	15.8
1973	18.1
1974	21.1
1975	17.6
1976	18.8
1977	19.2

The above information should provide the appropriate information to be inserted in the record.

Sincerely,

MARTIN R. HOFFMANN.

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Hillis says 25 percent. And let us assume that for the moment. The percentage is not that important.

What will these men do, the 25 percent who are admitted who we know cannot qualify as pilots? Will they be assigned to combat roles?

Mr. HOFFMANN. There are other combat roles in the Air Force besides flying. For instance, tactical air, where there are units in the field in the forward areas, a number of those supporting functions are considered to be combat by the Air Force.

You can say as a generalization that each cadet or midshipman admitted to a service academy is physically combat qualified. There are some commissions given in other than the combat arms for those who do not maintain those qualifications throughout their service, either because of physical injury or deterioration of eyesight, or what have you.

Mr. TREEN. But we know these men going in, unless they have some reversal of their eyesight condition, would have a very limited combat role and probably only in the area you just mentioned, the forward areas, for tactical?

Mr. HOFFMANN. I would think so; yes.

Mr. **Treen.** I am not suggesting by this that I favor this proposed legislation. I have not made up my mind on it. I, for one, am not convinced of a fundamental inequity in this Nation's deciding that men will perform the function of national defense. I am not convinced that that is invidious discrimination nor am I convinced it is unfair.

I have one other question. With regard to our newly founded Armed Services Medical College, do we have—maybe counsel for the committee can tell me—has any policy been developed with regard to admission of women to the medical university; or do you know?

Mr. **Hoffmann.** I do not believe we have. I will check on that and get an answer.

Mr. **Treen.** Does counsel of the committee know?

Mr. **Hogan.** I don't have the answer.

Mr. **Hoffmann.** I do not think the statute says anything one way or the other, as I recall.

Mr. **Treen.** As far as you know, there would be no reason not to admit women, although medical people could be in forward areas?

Mr. **Hoffmann.** I think that is correct.

Mr. **Treen.** I would be interested in knowing that.

Mr. **Hoffmann.** I will get you that answer, but I believe the answer is that there is no distinction made on admission.

Mr. **Treen.** Thank you. Those are all the questions I have.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Hillis?

Mr. **Hillis.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a few questions I would like to address to each of the gentlemen. I think these hearings are very important in many regards.

First of all, let me ask, hypothetically, what would be your opinion—and I understand that it can be only an opinion—if the equal rights amendment passes, where will we stand in regard to this issue then?

Mr. **Hoffmann.** This is a question that, as a lawyer, I cannot assure you is as neatly answered as one would like to be able to say it is.

The debates come out both ways. The opponents from time to time would state the firm position that if the equal rights amendment were enacted it would require the expansion of the draft to include women, women in combat, and that sort of thing.

A number of the proponents of the amendment took the view that this would not be required, that while the force of the amendment was to promote and establish equality before the law with women, it did not purport to override such across-the-board distinctions based upon, say, physical characteristics.

So I do not have a confident feeling one way or the other on the amendment, given its present history.

Mr. **Hillis.** I am very sorry I was detained a few moments this morning and missed the early part of your statement. But do I recall that you said that it is the policy of Congress and the policy of Government and of the Defense Department to determine what role women serve today; is that correct?

Mr. **Hoffmann.** That is correct.

Mr. **Hillis.** Under equal rights is it also conceivable that this right to make policy as far as national defense would remain with the Congress and with the Secretary of Defense, at least to a limited degree?

Mr. Hoffmann. The courts appear to have given a very wide latitude to the Congress and Department of Defense in the matter of raising armies, and in that context, in the manner of putting together the appropriate balance for a defensive posture. I would think that would not be quickly eroded.

Mr. Hillis. One of the main problems here, it seems, is this business of combat. I guess, I am searching my conscience on how I feel about this thing, and I am becoming more and more convinced—perhaps in terms of combat, when you consider an infantryman carrying a rifle and moving forward, I do not think I want to see my wife—or if I had a daughter—have to perform that service. But isn't it true that in this sophisticated age in which we live that there might be different types of combat service? I am thinking of Senator Cooke's statement that combat could be a lady sitting at a computer in North Dakota. Wouldn't this be a combat assignment that a woman could serve in effectively?

Mr. Hoffmann. I would defer to the Air Force on that particular assignment. I would think in general we are moving in the direction, as Mr. Nedzi and I discussed, of more and more career opportunities for women in different fields.

Mr. Hillis. Would that be a career opportunity that a woman could serve in in the Air Force?

Mr. Hoffmann. I would defer to the Air Force on that. My own personal view, based upon having toured the facilities, would be that it would not be.

Mr. Hillis. If there were all women in the silo? I have been in missile silos underground, and I know they are manned by usually no more than two people. But if they were both women, would there be any problem?

Mr. Hoffmann. I think one could make an intellectual argument that that would be all right. I have not myself thought through or explored the practicalities.

Mr. Hillis. If we make policy as to who goes to combat, couldn't we also determine there are certain combat functions that perhaps women could serve in and there are certain functions we would not ask a woman to serve in?

Mr. Hoffmann. Provided we can establish or that there is a rational basis for so doing, I think the answer is yes.

Now let me enlarge on that a moment. Obviously, we have the nurses who have traditionally been the women farthest advanced towards the combat zone. Now you do have policies, and they were exercised in the Vietnam conflict, with respect to forward deployment of women. It is usually done after the situation has settled down. And it is usually done only in those areas which can assure maximum protection.

So you have different shadings and different purposes, because obviously there is presumptively some protection with the Red Cross armband and the red cross on top of the hospital tent which you see which affords that degree of protection.

One would have to be careful, it seems to me, in articulating exactly what the purposes were and what the scope of the allowance was to assure that it was grounded in the rational distinction.

Mr. **Hillis**. Let us look at the Army's situation for a moment. Assume that a division is employed in a combat situation, it is inconceivable that a woman could serve at the divisional level, the G-2, G-3 or G-4 office? Are those combat roles?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. As a generalization, they are now so considered. I would defer to General Benade who has had combat experience. I am not sure one can generalize. From people I have talked with and served with and who tell various stories about their experience in division headquarters, one is liable to wind up right in the thick of the fray.

General **Benade**. I would have to echo what Mr. Hoffmann has said, Mr. Hillis. If you visualize a division deployed in a true combat situation, then I would venture the personal opinion that it would be better not to have women deployed. There is always a risk, Mr. Hillis, that in any kind of a ground engagement between armed forces that your positions or your lines can break. Your positions can be overrun and then your only salvation is either retreat or hand-to-hand combat.

And when you get engaged in hand-to-hand combat, particularly with bayonets, physical strength then becomes a large part of your ability to survive.

Mr. **Hillis**. I certainly understand what you are telling me, General. But I still think even in the Army itself there are probably roles that are so-called combat roles which could be manned as well by women. For instance, the silo operator in the Air Force.

General **Benade**. Again, I want to emphasize, Mr. Hillis, that I prefaced my remarks with "having the division in a true combat situation." For example, you used the illustration of the G-4 of the division.

It is very true that if he were located at the rear echelon of the division that a woman might be able to function there. But any G-4 worthy of the name, Mr. Hillis, is going to get out and go up where the supply problems are, and he is going to do what needs to be done on the spot. So he is right in there mixing. It is not as though the division staff, if they are doing their jobs properly, can just afford to sit back in the rear echelon.

Mr. **Hillis**. Of course, one of the great functions of the academy system, I think, is to prepare and bring the very best we have in our society today to the military and to educate and prepare them to assume leadership roles; is this not true?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. That is correct, sir.

Mr. **Hillis**. I wonder if, for the record, you could prepare and submit to us, say, a hypothetical career of an academy, West Point, graduate today. I know there are certain standards as you progress through a military career which you are expected to meet. There are certain schools, perhaps if you are going to stay in a combat MOS or assignment, which you must make before you are eligible for promotion. You have to go to the Army War College and the Staff Command School. There is a certainty when you are a major that you go through that procedure or you do not advance and pretty soon you are out of the service.

If women were to go to the academies, I am wondering if this would open this course to them?

General **Benade**. May I clarify one thing, Mr. Hillis, with the sole exception of entrance into the academies, women, today, are eligible for all of the other schools in the Armed Forces.

In other words, women may enter and do enter all of the basic courses and the advanced courses, required for advancement for the particular field one is in; and all of the colleges—the command and general staff college, the armed forces staff colleges and the war colleges. They are doing that right now.

Mr. **Hillis**. So the point is the only place they are not entering is the service academies?

General **Benade**. Correct.

Mr. **Hillis**. As far as the service academies themselves are concerned, there is very little actual combat training given at West Point or Annapolis or at Colorado Springs; is that not so?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. I think in terms of curriculum items, if you were to single those out and take the total 4 years—I do not have the percentages right off the top of my head, but it would probably be in the vicinity of 20 percent.

Mr. **Hillis**. I know in the summer they go to Fort Knox or they go to infantry school at Fort Benning. And that is where you get into combat training.

Mr. **Hoffmann**. Yes. I was referring to the total experience. Now I think beyond that that one needs to look at the Academy experience and the environment in which the regular instruction is carried on, because I think you will find there a synthesis of leadership exercise, the continuous and repetitive focus on self-discipline and the sorts of planned impersonal subjection to the various kinds of stresses which have been found to be appropriate for combat training and which give you the overall unique Academy experience.

Mr. **Hillis**. If women were to be admitted to West Point, should the plebe system be continued as far as female attendance is concerned?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. Mr. Hillis, I would like to defer to the services on that. I do not have an opinion.

Mr. **Hillis**. General, would you have an opinion?

General **Benade**. I, too, would like to pass on that, Mr. Hillis. I am not an Academy graduate, and, therefore, I think someone should answer that who is intimately acquainted with the Academy.

Mr. **Hillis**. The plebe system is basic to the very thing you are talking about.

Mr. **Hoffmann**. It is the idea of peer support and peer evaluation and the need for reliance on the corps, which is one of the fundamental aspects of the military force itself.

These sorts of things I think one would have to have in some measure. As a practical matter, they do have them in the other facilities we have adverted for the entering officer candidate.

Mr. **Hillis**. I think you made the point that women have been admitted to ROTC and they have measured up and done well; is that correct?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. That has been our experience to date.

Mr. **Hillis**. I would comment briefly. As I remember—I have an Air Force base in my area which for some years has accepted 6-week training for ROTC—they did have some women in the group, and I remember the base commander making the point that these girls did all the pushups the fellows did and measured up and went along with the program.

I believe they were housed separately and there was no problem. They graduated and went on. I think the women in some way got short shrift when they were taken into ROTC, particularly with the anti-Vietnam sentiment in this country. Actually they were the salvation of the programs on some campuses, for they would come in and participate when the services could not get male enlistees to do so. Also, it took away some of the effectiveness of the "anti" feeling against ROTC.

It seems to me what we are looking at here is what is the role of the woman career officer going to be? If she can serve through ROTC and officer's training, is her role to be one of having equivalent training which is necessary for an officer to move up in order to become a general officer? Is this not what we are trying to do, to educate as best we can?

Mr. HOFFMANN. That is what we are trying to do, and in our judgment, that is what we are doing. And we do not believe that under the present scheme—with the combat exception——

Mr. HILLIS. I take some exception to the combat emphasis here, because if I remember right—I was a reserve officer back when the Korean war started, I wasn't recalled—I guess just luck of the draw. But I remember a report which I think was carried in Time magazine that the June class of 1950 at West Point was largely sent to Korea. Of course, they were young junior officers and platoon leaders, basically. A lot of them were. And the losses were so heavy in that class that the balance of them were withdrawn from combat. I do not know if this ever happened to any other class, but we had put so much into training these young men and lost so many in such a short time that the Army actually drew some of them back because they wanted them for future leaders.

So to say that everybody who comes out of the Academy is going straight into combat, at least on the frontlines, leading a rifle platoon, may not be in our best interest.

Mr. HOFFMANN. The point I was trying to convey was not necessarily actual combat, although that is a possibility, but into the combat arms and into the combat-qualified unit. Now it is of interest that of the total number of West Point graduates, for instance, who are presently serving in the Army, over 90 percent are presently assigned to combat-oriented and combat-intended units.

I think there is no question that the action of the Army—if it were taken—to withdraw and preserve the remainder of the class of 1950, was taken with the idea not only of future leadership but of input to other officers and throughout the educational and training system that these particularly trained individuals are counted on to perform in the Army.

Mr. HILLIS. Let us assume for the purposes of argument that you are correct and women should not serve in combat in the Army, is it conceivable that Congress could amend this law or pass it in such a form that they might be admitted to one or two of the other service academies and not to West Point?

Mr. HOFFMANN. Right off the top, I would think that would be a possibility. I would want to look into it further and think it through. Are you saying "despite any constitutional objections"?

Mr. HILLIS. As I understand your argument, you do not believe there are constitutional problems here and that we have the right to make the policies for defense of the Nation?

Mr. HOFFMANN. Correct.

Mr. **Hillis**. Can we assume that we might see the day where we would send women to the Air Force Academy but not to West Point?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. If one could find a rational basis, I think that could be done. I would not be prepared to say you could not. My reaction is that perhaps you could.

Mr. **Hillis**. That is all I have.

Mr. **Fisher**. By way of clarification for the record on the point raised by Mr. Treen a moment ago about the medical school and as to whether there is any distinction between males and females among those to be admitted, we have just been informed by Mr. Slatinshek, the chief counsel of the committee, who handled that legislation, that there is no differentiation in the law. It is silent on that subject.

We hear these different figures used from time to time about the cost of maintaining a cadet or midshipman in the academy per year. Do you have any figures we could use which would indicate what is actually expended, amortized, or whatever way you come up with your figures, for the three academies?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. The overall figures, just to give you a comparison of these different acquisition sources which we mentioned, the comparison on an average basis goes as follows:

The service academies is $69,000 per cadet.

Mr. **Fisher**. Per year?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. What I am giving you now is the per commission cost, the total cost for a commissioned officer; $69,000 with regard to the service academies.

Under ROTC the scholarship commissionee, the figure is $18,000.

For the nonscholarship, the figure is $10,000. For OCS or OTS, the figure is $9,000.

Mr. **Fisher**. For each of those in the service academies the total cost for the 4 years is $69,000?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. Yes. I think there may be some variation, but it is all in the 1960's.

Mr. **Fisher**. Very well.

Let me ask you one other question which might be appropriate for the record.

Assuming that the committee should report a bill to admit women to the academies, is it your thinking that the living accommodations for them would require separate quarters? Have you given any thought to that, separate barracks and so forth?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. I would say yes. Now I think the services can give you a better idea of that. That I believe would represent the discussions we have had at OSD. Now assuming that combat is imperative for ladies, you can make arguments that since everybody is going to be under substantially equivalent circumstances in combat that one should do away with separate facilities of all kinds.

I think to some extent that one entrenches upon the separate but equal issue throughout the evaluation of how you would set it up. But I would think probably, initially anyway, given the fact that this is a concept which is in motion, we can trace in recent years movement in perceptions as well as movement in realization of these concepts that one might very well look for some kind of transitional aspects such as you suggest.

Mr. FISHER. The separate but equal facilities would be consistent with the manner in which women are now housed who are in the service today; is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMANN. That is correct.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hogan has called my attention to a letter dated May 18, 1973, signed by Roger Kelley when he was over at the Pentagon addressing himself to a request for an opinion about admission of women to the service academies.

His letter contains this language, and I mention it because it may lend some clarification:

> None of the statutes relating to any of the three service academies requires a person to be male in order to be eligible for nomination or appointment to the academies. The general rule of construction in the United States Code with regard to use of the masculine gender is found in 1 U.S.C. 1 which states that the masculine gender shall include the feminine gender except where the context indicates otherwise.

Does that need any clarification? I thought there was something in your statement to the effect that there is a prohibition, or maybe more than one, relating to that matter.

Mr. HOFFMANN. I think that Mr. Kelley and I may disagree in our interpretation. He takes a fairly limited view of the context in which these occur, although I would be inclined to take him on that ground also, placing some reliance on Black's Law Dictionary in which you can look up "cadet" and "midshipman" and you will find they both have a male gender.

Certainly the context of usage with respect to all three academies clearly contemplates the male gender. That is a operative consideration. I have recited some of the legislative history in the development of these statutes as well as most recently the Air Force Academy, and I think that is legitimate in the context here.

There might be some room to see some disagreement here. I would state that the position I have outlined today is the present position of the Department of Defense.

Mr. FISHER. Very well.

You stated in your formal statement, as I recall, that there is no nation in the world today which follows a policy of requiring women to perform in combat roles in the military service. Have I correctly stated your position?

Mr. HOFFMANN. That is correct, sir. That is our information.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hogan has some questions. But did you want to add something to that?

Mr. HOFFMANN. I think there are countries, such as North Vietnam which used women in various roles. There has been some publicity given to the utilization by the Israelis of women. It is our understanding that in all of those cases that as close as they came was to a combat support sort of role in the rear areas of the combat area. Again, I think it is worth comment here that when one looks at the role of women in the services, such as the Russian experience in World War II, you have in operation the imperatives of the defense of the homeland and the concept of the home guards and those sorts of things where you are defending your own soil. I think under those conditions the imperatives shift. I think it is consistent, certainly, with the development of the position of women in our society that it might also shift perhaps in such a case for the United States.

Mr. **Fisher**. One concluding thought. You brought up something today which had not been discussed before and which I think is rather significant and that is the danger involved in combat of having women captured and made prisoners of war and the complications which could arise from that in so many ways.

After all, isn't that really one of the basic reasons for keeping them out of combat, to keep them from being captured?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. We hold that it is, yes, sir.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Hogan?

Mr. **Hogan**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hoffmann, as I understand it, there are statutory provisions relative to the selection of candidates for the financial assistance ROTC programs, among them, how much required service the individual must perform when he is selected for such a program.

Now how do you distinguish between the statutory language there and the statutory language for the nomination and selection of candidates for the academies?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. I think that could easily be done immediately by looking at the legislative history of the Air Force Academy as a separate experience, as a separate unit within the services and as a separate institution within the overall scheme of defense education. I think that certainly applies.

Second, take a look at the usage which I adverted to earlier. There is simply no question that when the Military Academy at West Point was set up and the Naval Academy was set up that there was no contemplation of women at that time. And that usage under that statute has continued even to the present day.

I would submit a third aspect with relation to the Academies to this effect, that the overall statutory scheme and consideration for the institutions and maintenance of these institutions over the years has been continued by the Congress with active consideration of having an alternative institution for women. That is certainly very remote from the usage in the context of it being neutral.

Mr. **Hogan**. Are you saying that there was some contemplation of of woman entering ROTC when the provisions first became law?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. I am not sure when they first became law, and I am not aware of the extent to which they may have evolved. I do not see the strictures from a contextual point of view of operating in that area and operating in these very particular statutes which advert to very particular activities.

Mr. **Hogan**. Are you aware of any legislative history or congressional intent which would indicate that women were eligible for programs, scholarship programs, in ROTC?

Mr. **Hoffmann**. I am not particularly aware of any, but I will supply an answer to that, if I can, for the record.

Mr. **Hogan**. It would seem to me when that decision was made to make women eligible for ROTC scholarship programs that that must have been a consideration.

General **Benade**. I might point out, Mr. Hogan, the decision was first made in 1969 by the Air Force to open ROTC for the first time to women. Later, if I recall correctly, it was discussed and was a subject of discussion during the course of opening up or expanding the number of authorized 4-year scholarships.

At that time, if my recollection is correct, the intention to permit women to apply for and be accepted into the program was indicated before the Armed Services Committee. I might point out also, consistent with what Mr. Hoffmann has been saying, that the big difference is that absent the distinguishing feature which makes the academies unique—that is, the combat leadership role and the unicity of the experience there—these same things were not considered to be applicable to ROTC.

Mr. HOGAN. But in discussing it, General Benade, with Congress, was there ever any indication that prior to the time that you brought the matter to their attention in 1969 there was ever any intention of women going into ROTC programs, when the matter was legislated?

General BENADE. I appreciate the fact there is a dearth of legislative history on it, Mr. Hogan. I think the best thing we can do there is what Mr. Hoffmann has said, which is to research the history on that and see if anything can be provided.

Mr. HOGAN. All right.

Mr. Hoffmann, you indicated in your testimony—and I only mention this in order that we may clarify the transcript—that the restriction against combat for women recognizes the will of the American people. I wonder how that recognizes the will of the American people when there is no statutory restriction as far as women being involved in combat duty in the Army?

Mr. HOFFMANN. I am giving you a generalization of our impression. I do not know that any polls have been taken lately. I think the status of these laws as they have been passed, the continued maintenance of this regulation and policy in the Army, is of some persuasion, if not strength.

I assume that as we are holding these hearings now and as I have indicated before, this is a changing area. We do not feel it has changed to the extent that a number of the proponents of these bills feel it has changed. That is our conclusion based upon our collective exposure to the body politic over the period of recent years as well as the statute.

Mr. HOGAN. Can you offer any reason, in view of the position of the Department of Defense on these bills, as to why over the years there has not been a legislative proposal that women be prohibited from combat duty in the Army?

Mr. HOFFMANN. I think probably the Army did not feel they needed it in order to carry out their policy of some 200 years.

Mr. HOGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hoffmann and General Benade, we appreciate your appearance here today very much. Can you think of anything you would like to add for the record before you depart which may have arisen in your mind during the course of the questioning today?

Mr. HOFFMANN. I have nothing to add.

General BENADE. I have nothing.

Mr. FISHER. Very well.

I thank you very much. The committee will stand adjourned until next Wednesday.

[Whereupon, at 11:35 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned to reconvene on Wednesday, June 12, 1974.]

House of Representatives,
Committee on Armed Services,
Subcommittee No. 2,
Washington, D.C., Wednesday, June 12, 1974.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10 a.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. O. C. Fisher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. Fisher. The committee will come to order.

Our first witness this morning is the Honorable J. William Middendorf II, Secretary of the Navy, who is accompanied by Adm. Worth H. Bagley, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, and also Vice Adm. William P. Mack, Superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy.

We welcome all of you, and we are particularly delighted to hear from the Secretary of the Navy today. I understand the Secretary has been confirmed, and we congratulate him, and also the Defense Establishment for having his services available in that very important capacity.

So we welcome you this morning, Mr. Secretary, and you may proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. J. WILLIAM MIDDENDORE II, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Secretary Middendorf. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee.

It's a very great pleasure to be here today, and I am very glad that you introduced Adm. Worth Bagley, our new Vice Chief of Naval Operations, and Adm. Bill Mack, Superintendent of the Naval Academy.

I have the privilege of appearing and testifying on the appointment and admission of women to service academies, which is the basic objective of various bills now before this subcommittee. I am, of course, primarily concerned with this issue at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Md. My purpose is to express briefly the opposition of the Navy to the appointment and admission of women to this the finest institution available for the education and training of officers for combat leadership in the Navy and Marine Corps. Admiral Bagley and Admiral Mack will assist in providing any additional information the members of this subcommittee may desire.

The American people have by statute expressed their will that women should not be assigned to duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions or on vessels of the Navy other than hospital ships and transports. Women are thus precluded from the very military role for which the Naval Academy exists, that of educating and training officers for combat functions in the Navy and Marine Corps. Simply stated, unless the American people reverse their position on women in combat roles, it would be economically unwise and not in the national interest to utilize the expensive education and facilities of the Naval Academy to develop women officers. Therefore, it is imperative that education and training at that institution be reserved for those with the potential for combat leadership.

As a matter of interest, a recent sampling indicated that approximately 99 percent of all Active Duty officers who have graduated from the Naval Academy have thus far at some point during their service been assigned to a combat ship or aircraft, or are on their way to such duties, or have been assigned to a combat unit in a combat zone. The appointment and admission of women would displace combat-oriented male graduates for whom replacement in the officer corps would have to be sought from sources which do not provide, to a comparable degree, the scope of professional military training which is the pride and essence of the Naval Academy.

The Department of the Navy is vitally interested in maximizing the utilization of highly qualified women in noncombat functions. The current expansion of women officers in the Navy and Marine Corps is planned to continue in future years, and appropriate training and education will be required. However, there are excellent alternatives to the Naval Academy as a source of procurement for female officers. The Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps program offers to women wide educational opportunities coupled with a degree of professional military training appropriate to the positions they may be expected to fill in the Navy and Marine Corps. It would therefore be an inefficient use of public funds, and a loss of essential combat officers to the future officer corps of the Navy and Marine Corps to educate women at the U.S. Naval Academy so long as they continue to be precluded from a combat role.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement, and if you should desire Admiral Mack will make his statement, or I would be pleased to try to answer any questions you and the members of the subcommittees may have. We can do it either way.

Mr. **Fisher.** I believe the committee would prefer that the Admiral proceed, and after you all conclude your formal statements we may have some questions. Thank you. Admiral Mack, go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF VICE ADM. WILLIAM P. MACK, SUPERINTENDENT, U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

Admiral **Mack**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee.

In a sense, my statement supports and adds detail to the Secretary' statement, and I would like to start by saying I am happy to be here this morning.

As you know, the Department of the Navy opposes the enactment of H.R. 10705 and similar legislation.

The fundamental mission of the Naval Academy is to educate and train officers for combat roles in the Navy and Marine Corps. Section 6015 of title 10, United States Code, precludes the assignment of women to duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions and on vessels of the Navy other than hospital ships and transports. The national policy manifest in this legislation has been interpreted to preclude the assignment of women to any combat role in the Navy or Marine Corps.

Women are thus precluded by law from the type of role for which the Naval Academy exists to prepare its graduates.

For a number of years it has been the policy of the Department of the Navy that graduates of the Naval Academy who are physically qualified are to be commissioned in the unrestricted line of the Navy or in the Marine Corps. Unrestricted line officers of the Navy are those officers who are, by training and physical qualifications, eligible for command at sea. Only young men who are, at the time of their appointment, physically qualified for eventual commissioning in the unrestricted line of the Navy or in the Marine Corps are admitted to the Naval Academy. All midshipmen who are physically qualified at the time of graduation are commissioned in the unrestricted line or in the Marine Corps, with two exceptions. Each year one midshipman physically qualified for the unrestricted line is commissioned in the supply corps and one in the civil engineer corps. All other midshipmen commissioned each year in the restricted line or in a staff corps are young men who, by reason of some physical defect incurred while at the Naval Academy, are not physically qualified for commissioning in the unrestricted line. Thus, of the 899 commissioned officers from the class of 1974 who were graduated on June 5 of this year, 794 were commissioned in the unrestricted line of the Navy, 82 in the Marine Corps, and 23 in the restricted line or a staff corps of the Navy. Of the latter 23, 21 were not physically qualified for a commission in the unrestricted line. Of the 21, 19 were nonetheless physically fit for duty at sea, albeit in a restricted line or staff corps capacity.

In order that the Naval Academy may fulfill its mission to train unrestricted line officers for the Navy, an intense academic and professional curriculum has been developed. The Naval Academy is not just another educational institution which happens also to offer a professional military training program for its students. Rather, the converse is true. This can be seen from historical as well as practical considerations.

The origins of the Naval Academy trace back to 1845 and the founding of what was then the "Naval School." The course of study was 5 years, 3 of which were spent at sea. Academic instruction was given in gunnery, naval tactics, engineering, chemistry, mathematics, astronomy, French, and English. In 1851, the Naval School was reorganized into the Naval Academy, and the course of study was reduced to 4 years. This was the forerunner of today's basic 4-year curriculum at the Academy, which utilizes at-sea summer training cruises to augment classroom work.

While the present-day, 4-year curriculum of extensive academic studies interlaced with summer cruises was well on its evolutionary way, it was not until 1933 that the Naval Academy was authorized by Congress to confer degrees on its graduates. This followed accreditation of the Academy in 1930 by the Association of American Universities. Prior to 1933, a certificate of graduation had been awarded.

Since 1933 the Naval Academy has awarded a bachelor of science degree to its graduates in place of the certificate of graduation. This degree, however, is not awarded solely for completion of the academic course of study. In addition to successful completion of an academic curriculum, a midshipman must have achieved a certain level in professional studies and at-sea training and must have met required standards of conduct, physical education, and aptitude for service as a naval officer.

The historical uniqueness of the Naval Academy as, first and foremost, a military training institution continues today in the Academy's total course of instruction. To accomplish the uniquely military aspect of the Academy's mission, the student body is organized into the brigade of midshipmen. The 4,200-man brigade is divided into six battalions of six companies each and is advised and counseled by battalion and company officers who are, almost without exception, Navy or Marine Corps line officers ranging in grade from Navy lieutenant to captain and Marine Corps captain to lieutenant colonel. These battalions and companies of midshipmen work and live in Bancroft Hall, the midshipmen's dormitory, in a close-living relationship with brigade officers, who by precept and example, by the application of sound techniques of leadership, counsel, and guidance, and, when required, by the application of disciplinary measures, mold and motivate each midshipman for the day when he will become a line officer of the Navy or Marine Corps; and it is through the separation of midshipmen into regiments, battalions, and companies that the midshipmen compete in numerous activities, learn the basics of military command, and receive their professional military training.

The professional military training of a midshipman is the focal point of his annual summer training today, just as it was in years past. The new midshipman begins his military instruction as a plebe, or first year man, early in July of his freshman year. Each midshipman is quickly taught during this period that he is a learning subordinate, under close supervision and careful guidance. The rigorous routines and challenges of a plebe, or freshman, indoctrination system are unique to military academies. The system directly and fundamentally serves the Naval Academy's mission by developing self-discipline, ability to respond under pressure with good judgment, leadership capabilities, and a basic understanding of military relationships and the military environment. Plebe summer, which has as its basic objective the transition from civilian to military life in a short time, includes haircuts, the issuance of uniforms, the teaching of the basics of marching, the abandonment of civilian ways and days, and the assimilation of basic skills in seamanship, navigation, and signaling. Infantry drill, the firing of various weapons, the sailing of Navy yawls, and rigorous physical conditioning programs are also parts of plebe summer.

At the end of the first academic year, the intensive plebe indoctrination ends, and the first phase of a midshipman's at-sea training begins as the new third classman, or sophomore, departs on 2 months of training at sea aboard a combat ship of the fleet. During this first taste of life at sea, the midshipman comes to know and respect the Navy's enlisted people and to participate actively in a wide range of shipboard operations, watches, and general drills.

During the next summer, the new second classmen, who are juniors, receive the following familiarization training in the four warfare specialties which comprise the naval service: First, introduction to submarine service through lectures and cruises aboard fleet submarines at New London, Conn.; second, similar familiarization training at the Naval Destroyer School, Newport, R.I.; third, flight indoctrination in naval training and operational aircraft at Pensacola, Fla.; and, fourth, introduction to Marine Corps assault techniques at a Marine Corps training facility.

Finally, during the fourth and last summer, the new first class, or senior, midshipmen go to sea for training aboard combat ships of the fleet for their second and last time as midshipmen. During this cruise, the midshipmen function as junior officers, assist in the training of third-class midshipmen, work in navigation, stand watches on the ship's bridge, perform exercises in the ship's combat information center and engineering spaces and perform other functions in support of the daily shipboard routine.

While at the Academy, during the 4 academic years, interstitial professional training continues. All told, each midshipman devotes over 2,000 hours to military training and drills, all within the organization of the brigade of midshipmen. A midshipman's class standing at graduation depends significantly on his professional training performance, including the at-sea training periods. The professional training program includes lectures, practical training, physical education, and a variety of evolutions and drills.

While academic offerings and objectives of the Naval Academy have developed to provide career specialization required in the modern Navy, the academic curriculum continues to reflect basic Navy needs: The education and training of qualified line officers for service and eventual command at sea. Midshipmen have a common plebe year designed to provide a broad educational sample and a beginning in professional development. The professional courses taken during plebe year are designed for and oriented toward preparation of the plebes for their first cruise aboard a Navy vessel. Consistent with the Navy's technical orientation, majors in the engineering disciplines and the physical sciences, math, or operations analysis are encouraged. The academic goal of the Naval Academy is to produce educated graduates who are capable line officers, well trained in basic professional subjects, with combat specialties reflecting the needs of today's and tomorrow's Navy.

The mission objective of the Naval Academy is reflected in the first duty assignments of its graduates. As indicated above, most Naval Academy graduates are commissioned in the unrestricted line for service at sea. As a matter of policy, the great majority of these graduates go immediately to sea. Others go into aviation, nuclear power, and special warfare. Those graduates who, during the period of their matriculation at Annapolis, become not physically qualified for a commission in the unrestricted line, may qualify for a commission in the Civil Engineer Corps, the Supply Corps, or other specialties in the restricted line. The vast majority of all graduates will eventually find their way to sea. In the past, a very limited number of graduates went to medical school, but the academies were directed by Congress in 1973 to cease their premedical program on the rationale that the mission of the service academies is to train unrestricted line officers, not doctors.

Given the historic mission of the Naval Academy and its present-day function, that is, the training of line officers for eventual command at sea and other officers destined for duty at sea or with the Marine Corps, the appointment of women as midshipmen at the Naval Academy is neither sensible nor practical. Admitting women to the Naval Academy would have the dual effect of requiring alteration of the training and curriculum at the Academy and dilution of the mission of the Academy as a source of professional unrestricted line officers for the Navy. The paramount consideration with regard to the pending legislation is that, by statute, women are precluded from performing the very duties for which the Academy trains midshipmen because title 10, United States Code, section 6015 precludes the assignment of women to duty in combat vessels or in aircraft engaged in combat missions.

As I have endeavored to explain above, life at the Naval Academy is an intricate mix and interlacing of academic study and professional military training for life and duty at sea, in the air, or with the Marine Corps. It is this historic fact which makes instruction at the Naval Academy so unique. Moreover, I think it clear that this uniqueness was intended for the Academy. If women were admitted to the Naval Academy, I do not see how they could in any meaningful way partake of this historic mix of professional training and academic study, or realize upon its objective. As for all of the summer training, which I have described above, women would be barred by statute either from aspects of the training itself or from the performance of the duties for which the training is given. This is also true of much of the professional training during the academic year. The admission of women, without changing the law which precludes their service aboard ship and in combat, would require the Naval Academy to develop a two-track curriculum, one for combatants and one for noncombatants. Such a development would destroy the Naval Academy's monolithic, historic mission to educate and train the nucleus of the Navy's career unrestricted line officers. Moreover, if the Naval Academy were to develop a noncombatant curriculum, it might become necessary, on the basis of equality, for the Academy to permit men to pursue this curriculum, thereby further diminishing the number of unrestricted line officers graduated each year. Admitting women who are unable to capitalize upon the Academy's professional training and, thus, on the very unique resource which the Academy has to offer, is not consonant with either the historic mission or present function of the Naval Academy and would operate to the detriment of both.

I see several factors which aggravate this lack of consonance:

First, at present, the Naval Academy is a "fixed resource." Congress, by prescribing the appointment process, has set a ceiling on the total number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and the Naval Academy has endeavored to take full advantage of the authorized number to train line officers for the Navy and Marine Corps. Thus, in order to admit women to the Academy, the male enrollment and output of male graduates would necessarily drop, unless the laws regarding appointment were changed.

Second, most of the drop in output of male graduates would be in combat-oriented line officers, who, because of the unique training at the Academy, would have had roughly four times the amount of professional training received by naval officers in other officer accession programs for example—NROTC and OCS. Thus, there would be a diminution in the fleet of the very uniqueness the Academy has been constructed to offer. Moreover, this drop in officer accessions from the Naval Academy would have to be made up through increases in other training programs, which produce officers with only a fraction of the professional training of the Naval Academy graduate.

And third, under present legislation prescribing the nominating process by which midshipmen are admitted to the Naval Academy, and the proposal to admit women to the Naval Academy on the same basis as men, the Naval Academy would have no way to control the number of women to be admitted to each class. Thus, the number of women to be admitted to the Academy each year could be substantial. It would be extremely difficult, given the present statutory scheme of congressional nominations, to set limits on the number of women to be admitted. This would expose both the Academy and the officer corps of the Navy to unacceptable vagaries and uncertainties regarding the output of male line officers, who constitute the marrow of the naval profession.

Conversely, I do not see any advantages which would inure from appointing women to the Naval Academy, let alone justify the overall cost of such an action in terms of diluting the Naval Academy mission.

Little benefit would pass to the women appointed to the Academy. True, the Academy background is important to a career naval officer, but this importance is part and parcel of the Academy's historic mix of sound academic instruction and extensive professional education and training. The former without the latter renders the Academy background hollow and without distinction or differentiation from other training sources or academic institutions.

As I have stated, under existing law and societal concepts, there would be little purpose for women to participate in most aspects of the professional education and training program of the Academy. Thus, women attending the Academy would not profit from the historic and unique resource of the Academy. I think that's unfair to them. On the other hand, to the extent that women graduates of the Academy would derive some benefit simply from the Naval Academy name and its history, without having received the rigorous training for which the Academy is a hallmark, I think that unfair to other officers in the Navy, both male and female.

The above shows, I believe, that the question of appointing women to the Naval Academy is not simply limited to admission. Difficult questions arise after that initial decision, which portend continued uncertainty and, perhaps, even court involvement. The first question is the number of women to be admitted, as discussed above. Next, there is the issue of their professional training and academic study, once admitted. Obviously, women would require training and study responsive to the duties they will eventually perform. As I have said above, this would, I believe, require the development of a new and separate course of professional training and academic study, emphasizing noncombatant duties, rather than the present training and instruction which have been designed, by historical and practical considerations, to be responsive to the male naval officer's needs and, specifically, to the male unrestricted line officer.

I further visualize the necessity of other separating factors, viz living accommodations, professional training during nonacademic periods, and professional training within the companies of the brigade of midshipmen during the academic year. Related to this is the possibility that once we have developed this separate professional training program and course of study for women, the Naval Academy might be required to open this new program on the basis of equality to males who do not wish to train for the unrestricted line.

Given the mission and prime function of the Naval Academy to prepare naval officers for combat on the sea and in the air, a mission from which women are essentially precluded, and given the unique resource which the Naval Academy has in its professional-training/academic-study intermix, the present Naval Academy all-male admission policy insures that the Academy's special resource is allocated to those most likely to benefit from it. To admit women is to dilute this resource and offer to the women nothing of the Academy's uniqueness. I submit that is not a sensible trade.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you very much, Admiral.

Let me ask you a question or two, and then we'll move around in a moment to various numbers.

Assuming that all restrictions on combat service in the Marine Corps and the Navy were removed, that we repeal those, why would women not be qualified and capable in going out and performing on the ships or in the air, the combat duties that you have referred to?

Perhaps Admiral Mack could address that question.

Admiral MACK. I would be delighted, Mr. Chairman.

In my estimation, women could serve in any role in the U.S. Navy at any time if this law were changed. They could come to the Naval Academy; they could pass the course in large numbers, and do all that's required of them physically, mentally, professionally, and in any other way, and there would be little requirements for change in our course curriculum, physical facilities, or anything of that sort. If the law were changed, in my mind, women could do anything that men could do, and, in some cases, perhaps even better.

Mr. FISHER. Do you think perhaps the law should be changed?

Admiral MACK. That is not my call, sir, because I think this is a policy which will be determined by the people of this country and by the Congress.

Since historically we have never had women serve in combat since, I guess, the frontier days, and to do so would be a major policy change for this country, but assuming the change were made, I think it all follows, as I've discussed, that the women could do anything, and there would be little trouble on our side at the Academy in terms of admission processes, academics, professional training, or anything else.

Mr. FISHER. Is it your view then, Admiral, that the average woman who would be admitted would be capable of going through the rather rigorous training, physical training, that you have described in your statement, without any problem?

Admiral MACK. I have to go back to the word "average woman." The average man is not capable of doing this, certainly. The program is rigorous, and the young men who come there, when they come there, must be in good physical health. They're examined carefully. They must be able to pass certain physical tests, really only involved in determining whether their joints are sound and they can do the things that we require them to do for further training. Assuming women could do this—and I'm sure they could do this in great numbers—I see no reason, that if we made a few exceptions for their skeletal changes—there would be different kind of pushups perhaps from the kind we give—that they could go through the program we have, and do it well. Obviously, some women could not. Many men could not. It's strictly a question of that particular man or that particular woman.

Mr. **Fisher.** I was thinking, for example, and just to go to sort of an extreme, and yet it's one that has to be faced when you're planning for war—which, God forbid won't happen but which might happen—and that's what it's all about, preparing for it—it is a possibility that woman would be in an amphibious landing, such as many of the marines made during World War II out in the Pacific. Do you think a typical woman could be capable of carrying the load on her back, and the guns, and undergo the rigors that would be involved in that kind of an operation?

Perhaps they can. I'm just seeking information.

Admiral **Mack.** I would defer to my brothers in the Marine Corps on that statement, but I've seen a good many marines do this, and I would also say that the marines who do it are culled out from thousands of men. Perhaps the women who would do it would be culled out from thousands of women, and it would be only those who are physically capable of doing those things who would survive the training process.

But, in my estimation, having seen summer Olympics on television, having seen Billie Jean King on television, there are many women who can do all sorts of things that they are prepared for, and it would be a question, sir, of taking the training, passing it successfully, and demonstrating that that particular person, man or woman, could do the job.

Mr. **Fisher.** Would you foresee any particular problem as applied to women in case they would become prisoners of war?

Admiral **Mack.** Yes, sir, I'm sure there would be problems, as there have been in Europe in past times when women have been, as I understand it, on the Russian front, taken as prisoners of war. This would be a difficult thing, and anything that would happen to a woman, of course, we would not like to see, in terms of mutilation, death, or anything else. But this would be a problem that that particular woman would have to face, were she willing to encounter this kind of a condition and put up with it.

Mr. **Fisher.** Would it be optional to her whether she would be willing or not, as long as she's in the service and subject to the command, to the line of command?

Admiral **Mack.** Yes, sir. This would be a question of what branch of the Navy service we're talking about that she would enter. If she were to enter the Chaplain Corps or the medical parts of it, obviously, she would be restricted by the requirements there. If she opted to become a line officer, then, presumably, she would be subjected to being sent to combat involuntarily, just as a man is.

Mr. **Fisher.** Very well.

As I understand it then, to summarize, your views are that so long as there are restrictions involved against women being committed to, or becoming available for, combat duty at sea or in the air, it would create an extremely difficult problem for the Naval Academy to accommodate itself to the training of women because of the curriculum you have that's related so much to combat. Is that correct?

Admiral MACK. Yes, sir. More than that, I make the point again that by law I would be precluded from sending women out on summer cruises because these are combatant ships that midshipmen go on, so by law I would be prevented from giving them the very kind of training they ask for in coming to the Naval Academy.

This doesn't happen to be so in the other two Academies, but in the Naval Academy, since the law is peculiar to us, and since a ship is a unique sort of thing, where everyone on that ship is in a combatant status if he's being shot at, I could not send women midshipmen to sea and therefore they would not get the training they are asking for. As it is foreseen here and by law, I'm really precluded from giving them their equal rights. Therefore, I would have to substitute something else, such as training at a shore base, or perhaps some course given at the Naval Academy in the summer. Since the professional courses we give depend so heavily on knowing what kinds of weapons, and missiles, and so forth, they are going to see on ships and aircraft in the summer, many of the courses they now take in navigation, and weapons, and so forth, would have to be changed, or substituted for, and, in a sense, the woman there would not get what she is seeking, a good professional education and training.

By law I would have to do this. It's not our choice at all, but by law.

Mr. FISHER. In other words, you would have to change your curriculum in a number of respects if women were admitted unless the law you referred to were repealed?

Admiral MACK. That is correct. It's not our choice at all, but by law.

Mr. FISHER. Let me ask just one more question. I don't want to take too much time here.

Assuming this committee should recommend repealing those laws, and assuming we should report out a bill, and assuming it should become law, what kind of problem would you have about providing the necessary facilities for women at the Naval Academy, and what length of time would you require to prepare for that?

Admiral MACK. If we were assuming, sir, that the present bill is passed without the concomitant change in United States Code, Title 10, Section 6015, we would require about 8 months to put together new courses, to make arrangements to send them on a substitute for the cruise the following summer. Of course, it's already too late this year for any substantial number. It would be into the coming year before we could do this.

On the other hand, if the change were made in the statute to which I referred and they were allowed to take any course at all, very little time would be required, simply a changing of some of the rooms to provide private facilities, toilet facilities in the room, rather than in the large area. That would be very simple.

On the other hand, with the present bill you are considering, without the United States Code 10 law, about 8 to 10 months, because of changes needed in the curriculum, to acquire new instructors, to write new courses, and make changes of that nature.

Mr. FISHER. In other words, the curriculum probably would be your chief delaying factor, as a matter of fact?

Admiral MACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. FISHER. You do not have it in mind then having separate dormitories or barracks for the women?

Admiral MACK. There are three alternatives here. One is not feasible because we do not have a separate area. We'd have to construct one. In the present domitory system, we have eight very large wings interconnected, called Bancroft Hall. We have two alternatives within this mix. One is to put 3 women per room, in a room, and the present rooms now have a shower and a wash basin in the room. Obviously, plumbing could be connected to put a commode, privately screened, in that room, so that three women could live in that room, essentially separated from the men, who would be next door across the hall.

This would be our choice, to have three-women rooms, scattered throughout the brigade, so as to give them the sense of being part of the brigade.

Another choice, of course, is to segregate a small part of the dormitory and change that whole section, and barricade it, or whatever would be necessary, to put the women in a section. We think that's the lesser of the two choices.

The changes here would be nominal, $5,000 per room, and not very large. Other things would have to be done. We would have to change the dispensary facilities to accommodate them and their problems, and so forth. But these are minor matters, as compared to the main problem.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. Daniel?

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to join the chairman in extending a warm welcome to Bill Middendorf this morning. I think his performance will certainly reflect credit upon the Department of Defense and the country, and I don't believe the President could have found a better replacement for John Warner.

Secretary MIDDENDORF. Thank you.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Admiral Mack, I have about 6 questions that I want to ask you, and I'm going to ask the same questions of the other Academies, and ask you to respond to them in such manner as you desire. You may want to provide extensive answers, and if you do you may do so by providing them for the record, or however you choose to respond.

How do you define the combat role in the Navy?

Admiral MACK. Our legal opinion holds, I think, that in the Navy it is a ship designed for combat, that is, other than a transport or hospital ship, under the idea that a ship of the Navy designed as a combat ship, even an SSBN, for instance, or any other kind of ship, is liable to be shot at, or sunk, or damaged at any time by an enemy.

I make the point here because, unlike the other two services, again, a doctor or a chaplain can be in a combatant ship. He himself can be tagged merely a noncombatant, but he can be shot or wounded like anyone else.

With regard to aircraft, the definition here is: Does the aircraft have ordnance, and does it have ordnance aboard at that moment, and does it fly in an area where it might be required to expend that ordnance against an enemy, or might that enemy expend ordnance against him?

With regard to a carrier capable aircraft, it's a combatant aircraft if it lands on a carrier, the carrier being a combatant ship.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. How is the mission statement of the Naval Academy worded? Does it include "combat" wording?

Admiral MACK. It's extremely simple, and it just says we are to develop young men as professional officers for the Navy and Marine Corps. The requirements come from the requirements of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. You've already partially answered this next question, but you may want to expand on it.

What combat training is required of all cadets at the Academy? Do you desire to expand on what you've already said?

Admiral MACK. I think, sir, my statement and questions and answers fairly well covered this.

In the professional section, of course, is the necessity for knowing the full operation of the ship, its navigation, its engineering, its weapons, its missiles. All of these are combatant functions in a ship.

With regard to aircraft, our young men learn about the control systems of the combatant aircraft, their machinery, their engines, their armaments, their direction, and this is done not only in a classroom, but, in the case of ships, on cruises, and, in the case of aircraft, by actually flying at Pensacola for a short time for indoctrination.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. What percent of your job classification slots are in combat roles today?

Admiral MACK. This is, again, not my province. I would hope to furnish this for the record. But, to my memory, it is 75 percent, or else very close.

[The following information was received for the record:]

A review of Navy officer billets shows that 75.4 percent require combatant expertise. However, it should be noted that the requirements of those billets to which unrestricted line officers are assigned for their first tour of duty are the requirements which the U.S. Naval Academy is primarily tasked to meet. There are 5,051 of these billets of which only 500 do not require combatant training. Thus the Naval Academy must train graduates to fill first tour assignments for unrestricted line officers, 90 percent of which require performance of combat related duties. Qualifications earned during this critical first tour fit the officer for subsequent assignments requiring combatant expertise.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. What percent of your Academy graduates are related to combat roles? I believe you said 97 percent in your statement; did you not?

Admiral MACK. It would vary from year to year. I believe the Secretary said 99 percent. It is somewhere in the extreme high nineties each year. I think if you search the career of each man far enough you would find that he, without exception, goes to a combat role, unless somewhere along the line he is waylaid physically; that is, he has a disease, or something of that sort. But the intent and the desire is that each one serve.

I might clarify the record a little bit. I believe it was talked about here earlier that Roger Staubach, a rather famous graduate, did not do his duty. As a matter of fact, he did, in the Supply Corps. He was in Vietnam in a combat area, and he completed his entire required duty before he went to professional football.

You will have to look very carefully to find a single exception to this policy of each man going to combat.

I think, again, the question is that even though a man may be restricted, as we call it, and have some physical disqualification from being an unrestricted line officer, he does, say, as a supply officer or as an intelligence specialist, go to a ship, which, again, in the Navy is unique. That ship goes to combat, and he may be down in the back end of it, but he gets shot at just like the fellows up in the front end, and therefore he is in a combat situation. So almost all, almost without exception, maybe 1 percent, do go.

Mr. Dan Daniel. What percent of the Navy's combat officers are produced at the Academy?

Admiral Mack. I can give you some approximations from the current fiscal year and others. The Naval Academy input to the total officer accession this year, I believe, was around 11 percent. About 13 percent are NROTC Regular and OCS, my guess is—and I'll give you the exact figures for the record—about 3 and 5 percent.

[The following information was received for the record:]

Officer accessions by source—fiscal year 1974

	Percent
USNA	11
NROTC Regular	14
NROTC contract	3
OCS(M)	4
AOC	7
NFOC	8
ROC	3
AVROC	2
Merchant marine	1
NESEP	3
Total	56
Direct procurement/student programs, healing arts, Chaplain Corps, JAG, Civil Engineer Corps, Supply Corps	30
Others/recall, warrant, women, interservice transfer	14
Grand total	100

There are other accession groups. Some come directly commissioned, such as nurses, doctors, and so forth. This figure I am giving you for Naval Academy input is about 11 percent. What makes this percentage low is the fact that there are large numbers of officers brought in the Navy each year coming from direct commission sources, such as doctors, nurses, lawyers, and so forth, who come in in large numbers, serve a short time, and leave.

But the essential part of the Navy largely comes from the Naval Academy. I can give you the exact figures for the record.

[The following information was received for the record:]

OFFICER POPULATION BY SOURCE

[In percent]

Source	Fiscal year— 1971	1972	1973
Naval Academy	14.99	15.82	16.20
Merchant Marine OC	.81	1.18	.98
AOC	7.65	7.46	7.04
NROTC (R)	10.03	10.63	11.06
NROTC (C)	4.33	4.17	3.46
OCS	17.14	15.79	15.50
ROC	2.75	2.73	2.77
NAV CADS	5.95	5.54	4.98
Wave/Nurse Corps	2.16	2.79	3.42
Direct appointment—Prospective Med., Dental or Chaplain Corps	4.87	4.90	4.81
Other military academies	.22	.21	.21
Direct appointment, other	9.54	8.82	9.68
USN/USNR integration program	1.49	1.40	1.22
LDO/LDO-T programs	5.05	4.46	3.59
Warrant officer program	1.66	1.83	2.51
Temporary officer program (FR. Enl)	.06	.02	.02
NESEP programs	2.27	2.76	3.09
MSC from enlisted	1.07	1.15	1.23
Aviation midshipmen	.49	.47	.44
V-7, V-9, V-11, V-12 programs (WW II)	1.18	.98	.75
AVROC	.99	1.30	1.51
NFO program (135X)	3.78	3.83	3.86
Misc. programs	1.52	1.76	1.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

Mr. DAN DANIEL. How much of this combat training is accomplished at the Academy? Is some of this training farmed out, or is all of it done there now?

Admiral MACK. All of it is here, sir, except, as I say, with the exception that they go to sea in ships for that purpose in the summer. So essentially, all of the professional training of the young officer at the Naval Academy is done there with the exception of summer cruises.

When a young officer leaves the Naval Academy he is qualified as a junior officer to be a division officer, to go into a ship into the gunnery; or engineering, or any other department, and he goes there and he performs professionally, upon arrival aboard the ship.

On the other hand, a young officer from NROTC, or OCS, while a fine young man, and having about one-fourth the professional training of the Naval Academy graduate, usually takes the jobs not requiring professional knowledge, and then over a period of 3 to 4 years goes to Navy training schools from his ship, learns on the job, and at the end of 4 or 5 years he's an equally capable young man, and, conversely, our Naval Academy graduate, who is deprived somewhat of liberal arts in his Academy education, hopefully, reads, broadens his educational outlook, and then at the end of about 4 or 5 years these officers from various sources are as one.

But initially what makes the Navy go is the young Naval Academy graduate. He goes right to the ship and performs right now, day one, and not after 6 months, or 3 years or 4 years. This is the main strength of this training program, and one of the main reasons why we need every officer we can lay our hands on to go to the ships from the Naval Academy.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. That's the distinction I was trying to make. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. Let me suggest before the next questioning begins that we have several very distinguished Navy officers and Marine Corps officers here, and we are very anxious to make a complete record, a very informative record, during these hearings. We are going into this matter very thoroughly with each service. Let me suggest that when a question is asked, if anyone present would like to add anything, or make any contribution that would be relevant and responsive, raise your hands, because we want to hear from everybody who wants to be heard, who might throw any light on or enlarge upon the answers that are given.

The Chair will call the members in the order of their appearance at the hearing this morning. Mr. Montgomery is first.

Mr. **Dickinson**. I was here before we started.

Mr. **Montgomery**. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. **Dickinson**. No; go ahead.

Mr. **Montgomery**. Mr. Secretary, or Admiral, if you could answer, what is the policy of women going to sea now in the Navy?

Admiral **Worth Bagley**. The policy, in accordance with title 10 United States Code, section 6015, is that women cannot serve in combat vessels in the Navy except on transports and hospital ships.

Mr. **Montgomery**. But they are at sea now?

Admiral **Worth Bagley**. They are at sea, on the USS *Sanctuary*, now.

Mr. **Montgomery**. Admiral Mack, I might have misunderstood, but I got the impression that if the law were changed you really wouldn't have too many problems, and that you could work it out by having females at the Naval Academy, and this didn't upset you much.

Was I reading you right?

Admiral **Mack**. This is correct, sir. This, of course, would take a change in national policy, that women could serve in combat. Once it's determined they can serve in combat, and the restriction is lifted, our problems are quite simple, other than the problems that we might ordinarily have with young men and women in close quarters.

Admiral **Worth Bagley**. Mr. Montgomery, it might be worth adding that, looking at it from the perspective of the Navy manager developing requirements and determining what resources it takes for a particular job in the Navy, you can appreciate the fact that, through the years, we've operated under the current law, so we've looked at it from the experience with men going into combat and not women. As a consequence, the knowledge that we've had to link resources with people, and people in turn, with requirements, has been based on the male, so we've been able to evolve ways to test him and determine ways in which to maximize the advantages and to minimize his weaknesses.

So if we move into an area where the will of the people, as expressed by the Congress, has changed in a major way from the way we operated in the past, obviously we've got to sit down and reassess this new situation of resources against our requirements. So I think that we would have a lot of homework to do, and we haven't thought about this in any great depth.

Mr. **Montgomery**. Don't you think you probably should become quite concerned and get the wheels turning over there? Quite frankly, I don't know how I'm going to vote on this bill, but I think eventually it's coming, and Congress will pass legislation that will put women into the academies.

You really don't have any feel right now of whether women could hold up in combat? No studies have been made at this time, or is there any information at all?

Admiral **Worth Bagley**. None that I'm aware of.

Obviously, we're giving thought to the best way to use women in the Navy, but the scope of this sort of change, we just don't have anything on.

Mr. **Montgomery**. Mr. Secretary, what is your feeling on this, if we would change this part of the law which restricts women from going into combat? Have you any thoughts or updated information on this matter?

Secretary **Middendorf**. About whether women should serve in combat, or whether we should change the curriculum of the Naval Academy, or both?

Mr. **Montgomery**. Both.

Secretary **Middendorf**. I would, as I said in my statement, be opposed to—and I think the Navy would be opposed—having women in the Academy unless the law were changed.

I'm not very keen, personally, about seeing that law changed. That's my personal view. I don't want my daughters to serve in combat. I have three of them. And that's my personal view.

It's up to the Congress and the public to make that determination. Whatever Congress says, we're going to say, "Aye, aye, sir," and we're going to do it, and do it really well. I just would hope personally that it is not changed.

Turning to the Naval Academy, I would be hopeful too that we didn't lower any standards. Now, Admiral Mack was very careful to stress this, in talking about changing standards—and I support that. I think it would not be the will of the people or the will of the Congress to change or lower any standards because I have a suspicion that they want those Academies to be as tough as possible, and to continue as the real heartbeat of our national security for the future.

Mr. **Montgomery**. Thank you, sir. I only have two more questions, Mr. Chairman.

What concerns me about all of our Academies—and if anyone of the panel could add to this—is that I find that some of these appointees that I've sent to the Academy really are going there to get an education, and then they go and get a law degree, or they're getting out of the Navy, after they've graduated from the Academy, and I've always felt that if a fellow goes to the Academy, unless it's very exceptional, he should make it his profession if he goes to the school.

Is this getting worse now? What is the percentage compared to 10 years ago with regard to Naval Academy graduates? How long do they stay in, and what percentage stays in, makes a professional career?

Admiral **Mack**. I think this is a misconception that a person can come to the Naval Academy and then, in a sense, get out right after his graduation and go to law school. He cannot, with very few exceptions. There are one or two cases. Where a man was physically disqualified, he could have been allowed to do what is called taking a sabbatical, or, in a sense, going on prolonged leave without pay, completing his law degree, and coming back into the Navy. There are very, very rare exceptions. By and large, anyone who goes beyond the second year in the Naval Academy, then if he wants to leave, must do service as an enlisted man to pay back that educational cost. If he completes the full 4 years, he's still obligated to serve 5 years, and everyone serves 5 years. There are no exceptions.

So that when I hear these things I'm really a little lost to find the source, because this does not happen.

As far as attrition is concerned, we lose at the Naval Academy about 33 percent of the entering class over a 4-year period. This is under investigation by the General Accounting Office now. Our attrition is far less than that of the other two Academies. It happens to be far less than that of major 4-year universities, who experience about 50-percent attrition.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I was actually talking about after the 5 years.

Admiral MACK. I'm sorry, sir. I was going to lead to that.

After the Academy is finished, then we know that after the 5-year obligated period 60 percent of our Naval Academy graduates stay in for a much longer period. We know also that only about 38 percent of the Regular ROTC graduates stay in. We know also that only about 10 percent——

Mr. MONTGOMERY [interrupting]. How many of the ROTC's stay in?

Admiral MACK. Sir, 38 percent, depending on the year you choose, for the NROTC contract program the one which has the lesser obligation and the educational benefits are more limited, the retention rate is only around 18 percent, and for the OCS group, which get very little, it is around 10 percent.

So the Naval Academy does provide the strength in the later years in the Navy, in the sense that over 60 percent of their graduates stay in for long periods, as do graduates from the other Academies also.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. You don't think this is a problem then?

Admiral MACK. No, sir, it is not. We would like to see, I think, a a little larger percentage stay, perhaps 75 percent, which the Air Force has.

I think this is a question of the young men who are reaching an obligation point now, went into service 5 years ago, and they have had 5 years of extremely arduous combat-oriented duty in Vietnam, with long tours overseas, and I think some of this is the cause of the 60-percent rate, which we would hope to see go up to 70 to 75 percent.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Thank you, sir.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. DICKINSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, would like to commend the Secretary and welcome you and your very clear and comprehensive statement on your program.

Most of the questions that have been raised in my mind, I think, have been answered.

I didn't understand an answer to one question that Mr. Montgomery put, though. Some time back there was a lot of publicity about WAVES going to sea. Assuming they did not serve on a combatant ship, I suppose they would serve on some sort of cargo ship.

Do we have any WAVES at sea now, and what are they doing, and ow does it work out? Would someone like to answer that?

Admiral MACK. I think I can answer that, yes, sir.

They are now serving on the *Sanctuary*, which is a hospital ship.

Mr. DICKINSON. That's the only ship on which females are serving in the Navy now?

Admiral MACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. DICKINSON. On page 6 you said that a midshipman devotes over 2,000 hours to military training and drills.

What percent of the total 4-year curriculum would be classed as combat training, from which a female would be excluded?

Admiral MACK. Let me put it another way, and instead of 2,000 clock hours, put it in academic hours. Academic hours spent on education at any major university are roughly 140 academic hours per 4 years. Our men spend in professional courses the equivalent of about 140 additional hours.

Mr. DICKINSON. About half?

Admiral MACK. Just about half on professional subjects and training.

Mr. DICKINSON. So I can see where you have a problem, sir, peculiar to the Navy, and you would experience difficulties, without changing the law, that the other two services would not be faced with.

But to paraphrase what you've just said, approximately 50 percent of the curriculum that a midshipman goes through is devoted solely to combat, toward combat readiness and training, and, conversely, without a change in the law, 50 percent of a woman's time would be wasted if she took these courses?

Admiral MACK. That is approximately correct, sir, about 50 percent. I wouldn't say wasted, since she would have some knowledge of the Navy, obviously, that would help her in what she does ashore, but, in a sense, it would be wasted since we should have a man doing that because he's the only one who could use it at sea. In that sense it is wasted.

Mr. DICKINSON. In your profile of Academy graduates, you say that the average Academy graduate serves, roughly, how many years? You say about 30 percent serve long tenures. Do you have any figures on that? How many finish 20 years?

Admiral MACK. I would say of that 60 percent about half of those finish 20 years. The curve goes down because of various reasons. For involuntary reasons, not being selected for higher rank, and so forth, the curve begins to go down.

Mr. DICKINSON. You think then that figure of 60 percent would go to finish their professional career of at least 20 years?

Admiral MACK. I would say not all; no, sir.

Mr. DICKINSON. Not as many as 60 percent? Fifty percent?

Admiral MACK. Perhaps half of that would go on to 20 years.

Mr. DICKINSON. I see.

Adm. DAVID BAGLEY. We don't have those precise figures, but it is about 45 to 50 percent of those officers that we would expect to stay in for the full career.

Mr. DICKINSON. You mean of the graduating class, or of the 60 percent that we were talking about?

Adm. DAVID BAGLEY. Of the graduating class.

Mr. Dickinson. The chairman and I were just remarking up here about the fact that you have such a high incidence of retention from the Academy graduates. Sixty percent is really high.

Admiral Mack. That, of course, is after a 4-year period. Admiral Bagley, of course, is much more qualified to know how many stay beyond that. I can't really address that except to make an estimate.

Mr. Dickinson. Would you anticipate any problems in connection with women in the service insofar as duty stations abroad? At any rate, are there any remote places where they might present a unique problem, or aboard ship, where they might present a unique problem, such as separation from family, where you might envision some difficulties for women different from men?

Adm. Worth Bagley. In addition to some of the other points that have been made, we have hazardous duty in the Navy, SEAL's, underwater demolition, and that sort of thing.

Mr. Dickinson. They are all voluntary, aren't they?

Adm. Worth Bagley. Not in every case.

We have in the naval officer structure about 4,000 billets devoted to that purpose, so that perhaps would pose a problem.

Mr. Dickinson. But if they are not all volunteer, they are for the most part volunteer, aren't they, the SEAL's, the UDT's, and the TCO's.

Adm. Worth Bagley. A significant proportion of it is. I don't have it available, but we can put in the record the exact number that are.

[The following information was received for the record:]

There are 4040 officers in billets requiring them to receive hazardous duty pay in FY 74. 2988 of these are filled by volunteers. This number can be segregated into the following categories:

Submarine duty	2, 816
Parachute duty	172
Others—Diving, demolition, seal/UDT, flight deck,[1] etc	1, 052
Total	4, 040

[1] Note flight deck duty assignments are not voluntary.

It would be wrong, however, to assume that only the billets categorized above involve hazard. Any billet in the operating forces—most of which are not volunteer billets—could involve substantial hazard to the incumbent. Contingencies such as fire, collision, boating in the open sea, ordnance mishaps, or machinery derangement can require the performance of hazardous functions by those personnel assigned to the unit involved.

Mr. Dickinson. Could you give me some examples of hazardous or extrahazardous duty that would not necessarily be voluntary?

Adm. Worth Bagley. Admiral Mack has talked about the hazardous duty in any vessel in the Navy, with the exception of the transport and hospital ships, so that's another example.

Mr. Dickinson. But that's a lot different than the SEAL's, where they learn to jump from the airplanes, swim under water, and work with demolition charges. I was just wondering whether there was another area where we have hazardous or extrahazardous duty that is not voluntary in nature.

Adm. WORTH BAGLEY. None that haven't been discussed in that context, Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. DICKINSON. Do you see the need for more officers of higher rank in the Navy? We're attracting womenpower to fill out our manpower requirements in going to the All-Volunteer services. As you get more women in the uniform of the service, you're going to need more officers and senior officers who are women.

Would this hold true in the Navy, or is there some policy there?

Adm. WORTH BAGLEY. In the program that we're following now for women, we are experiencing a very significant increase. In fiscal year 1975, there will be about a 50-percent increase in women officers since fiscal year 1972. Over the same period, the numbers of enlisted women will triple.

Mr. DICKINSON. You expect to increase your women officers 50 percent. You say it has nothing to do with the Academy, whether they are admitted to the Academy or not. Would it be an advantage, though, to have women graduates from the Academy, over the candidates that you are getting now?

Adm. WORTH BAGLEY. In the context that we have talked about, under the current law, we wouldn't think so. We would think it would be much more efficient to go ahead and train women officers as we're doing it.

It costs $62,000 to train an individual at the Naval Academy; $21,000 in the NROTC scholarship program, and about $7,000 now to train a WAVE at the OCS. The ROTC has only been in effect now only for a few years.

Mr. DICKINSON. Are you being successful in attracting women to your ROTC program?

Adm. WORTH BAGLEY. Very successful, and there are five or six applicants for every one that is chosen.

But one of the main arguments, Mr. Dickinson, I think, for continuing the trend that we have now, at least under the circumstances of the present law, is this question of cost, because there are somewhere between 30 to 75 percent of the currently authorized naval officer billets to which women can't, either legally or rationally, be assigned.

On the opposite side of that coin, if we put a man in the Naval Academy for that same $62,000, he has the potential of filling 100 percent of officer billets.

So, looking at it from the manager's standpoint, we think what we are doing now is reasonable and rational.

Mr. DICKINSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's all I have.

Secretary MIDDENDORF. Mr. Dickinson, if I could just add to that, following the Chairman's suggestion?

At the present time approximately 25 percent of the women who are in the Navy, are officers. For the entire Navy, men and women combined, about 8 percent are officers. Two-thirds of the women in the officer corps are in the healing arts area, primarily nursing areas, highly specialized.

Mr. DICKINSON. Thank you.

Mr. FISHER. Mrs. Holt?

Mrs. HOLT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's certainly a pleasure to have you gentlemen with us this morning, and I'm very proud to have the Naval Academy in the Fourth District of Maryland. I certainly know the fine institution Admiral Mack presides over up there, and the great tradition that has been carried on at the Naval Academy.

However, I would like to ask Admiral Mack, if you feel that it's really insurmountable. I have to agree with the Secretary that I don't want to see the combat restriction changed. But I was very interested in the Israeli system when we were over there. They do train their women, but they have a dual system, and they take cognizance of the fact that they are the childbearers, and I think that's very important. We are different.

But would it be insurmountable to have a dual system? You do have a dual system now, in that you have unrestricted and restricted men. Why couldn't we change the appointment law so that we wouldn't detract from the number of men that you could produce, and this would give the women the opportunity to take advantage of the fine education that's there for them, and to go on in their naval career, if they chose that?

Admiral MACK. Mrs. Holt, we at the Naval Academy are very proud that you come to see us as often as you do, that you are a member of the Board of Visitors, and we always look forward to your visits, and I think that we can thank you now for all that you have done for us.

In answering the question, I have not made enough of an issue, I think, of the physical restrictions at the Naval Academy. It's true that the appointments we can give are 4,444, plus or minus a few who are descendents of Medal of Honor winners. That is a legal restriction. However, the physical restriction is about the same.

We have at the beginning of the year, in September, the 6th or 7th, the 1st day of the year, 4,300 midshipmen in the Naval Academy. That is because that's exactly the number we can seat in the mess hall, or ward room, and it's exactly the same number of bunks we have in the rooms. Obviously, we could squeeze a few more in by doubling bunks, and perhaps having a double sitting somewhere in the corner. It happens to be also roughly the number we can accommodate with the classroom size, that we have instructors for, and so forth. So 4,300 is the size that we are desigend for, and we operate for.

Now, if we were to do as you say, we couldn't do it by adding. We'd have to do it by subtracting men. I think that's the crux of our argument. And if we do as you say, we would subtract men because we only have the physical size to take 4,300, and that would result in the lowering of the readiness of the Navy because we could not then send those men out to the Navy to be 1st-day operating Naval officers. You would have to fill in those numbers from OCS, or otherwise.

So that's the real barrier to the suggestion you're making. If it were not for that, obviously, with time and a little money, and so forth, we could construct a course for woman.

Mrs. HOLT. But we could change the physical facilities. If we found that there were large numbers of woman applying, then we would increase the size of the mess hall.

Admiral MACK. You could do that. Also, you would have to increase the size of the whole physical plant of the Naval Academy.

For instance, we have some beautfiful new buildings, as you know, there. These are now being built up to where they can handle 4,300 people. There are many buildings that were designed for 1,500. The physical facilities, such as the swimming pools, where we train people to swim—this is a very important sort of thing in the Navy—and the athletic buildings were designed for 1,500. That's about all they accommodate.

So there are many areas that we can accommodate less than 4,300. If we were to build facilities for, say, 100, 200, 300 women, something of that sort, it would have to be done with so much more barracks space, so much more mess hall space, and across the whole spectrum of the combinations of facilities we have there. It would be perhaps an extensive process. It could be done. It would take some time to do.

Mrs. HOLT. I gather, from your remarks you don't think it would be insurmountable in the training to have a dual system?

Admiral MACK. No. We can, of course, do that, given time to put the courses together, hire the instructors and find the classroom space, either by building or by doing something else. We would have to do teaching at night, or something of that sort.

Mr. HOLT. Thank you.

That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, you indicated that:

> The appointment and admission of women would displace combat-oriented male graduates for whom replacement in the Officer Corps would have to be sought from sources which do not provide, to a comparable degree the scope of professional military training, which is the pride and essence of the Naval Academy.

You make a point of that where it involves women, but it doesn't seem to disturb you when we allow foreign nationals to come to the Academies. I recognize there's not a large number of them, but this was never brought up as an issue at that time.

Do you have a comment to make about it?

Admiral BAGLEY. I think that one element there, Mr. Wilson, which is very important, is that with the size of the Navy that we have, with the decreases over the past years, that one of the most important things that we can do is keep very close to our allies. This has been traditional in the Navy, and we have relationships, particularly in South America, but it's now expanding to other parts of the globe, where very lasting and close relationships are established in the Naval Academy at the same time, when we go ahead with that sort of thing.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Well, there's two sides to that, Admiral. We've trained some of the South Americans at our Naval Academy, and they've gone out and participated in the raiding of American tuna boats in Chile, and Peru, and Ecuador. This is a two-edged sword, I think, in some cases. I think sometimes we overdo this business of involving our allies. I think it does not altogether work out the way it should work out.

Adm. WORTH BAGLEY. I don't believe that's in the curriculum though, I'll say that.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Mr. Secretary, you indicated, I think, that if women were admitted to the Academy the standards would have to be lowered, is that right?

Secretary MIDDENDORF. I think I said if the standards were lowered, I would be very much against it. If the standards were merely changed, but maintained, it might be possible to work out though I'm not sure I can see how.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. I thought you were going beyond what Admiral Mack had said in indicating that possibly there would be a lowering of standards if women were admitted to the Academy.

Adm. WORTH BAGLEY. There may have been a question there about the assumption of whether or not the current law on combat requirements had been changed, or had not been changed.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. You have a very strict regulation on the admission of applicants to the Naval Academy insofar as eyesight is concerned, and it's my understanding that to go into combat, or to be trained for combat at the Naval Academy, they should have 20–20 uncorrected vision. Is that right? You do make exceptions, but what I'm getting at is you have lowered your standards for various reasons, for football players, and so forth, below what the combat standards are.

Secretary MIDDENDORF. I don't think the standards have been lowered for any applicants coming into the Academy. There are those who lose visual acuity during the period of their tour of duty there.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Now, you've made exceptions for new admissions into the Academy, and you know you have. You're new on the job and are not aware of it, maybe. I think Admiral Mack might be able to speak to that.

Admiral MACK. I think that's a little bit overblown. We do have authority to make an occasional, one or two a year, exception, for color blindness, and this can be taken care of in the sense that if that person—once in awhile he is an athlete, most of the time he's a brilliant person academically, and we need him—and he goes into engineering specialty, or he goes into the supply corps, where he does not need the requirements for visual, or color unblindness, so to speak. He doesn't have to recognize color.

Other than that, there are very few exceptions, where we accept someone with perhaps a little less than English perfection, because we think we can teach him that.

I think the Secretary was talking about our standards being lowered, meaning our professional standards would be lowered, which would have to be because we could not send women to sea. I don't think it was anticipated that physical standards would be lowered. We would do one thing; that is, women are structurally not put together to do certain kinds of things, with regard to pushups and pullups, and we would change that because that would be necessary.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. I don't think this is a big problem, Admiral. The issue's been raised by many Members of Congress, and it's been raised by the military people, but I can't see this as a pushup-pullup thing.

Admiral MACK. This is not an issue, sir. They would be required to take the same physical training and do the same things the men do, and that's not an issue, and we would not do anything about lowering the standards there.

The only standards we're talking about would be those concerning professional education, where we would be required by law to lower them because we could not send them to sea.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. Admiral, I wanted to compliment you on your response to the questions. I felt that you have been very objective in your response to the questions. I was a little disappointed in your prepared statement, but as you responded to questions, I thought you expressed your true feelings as to much of this.

I didn't see any great opposition you have to allowing women to come into the Academy when you presented your own personal opinion. You didn't seem to feel there was too much that had to be overcome.

Admiral **Mack**. Thank you, Mr. Wilson. The Navy loves women; the Naval Academy loves women; and I love women. It's not a question of being opposed to women. The question simply is, as we said, we have a fixed resource. We can only put so many people into it. If we do put women in, and they are precluded by law from combat duty, from doing what we have to do, then we are suffering some readiness in the Navy, and that's our real concern.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. You're talking about law change now. Yesterday, we just changed a law, passed a bill, at the request of the Navy, and this is done all the time, and if we have to change the law to make it possible for women to come into the Academy, we can pass a law. So I don't see that this should be a big hangup, or whether we should dwell on it too much. If we feel that this is the proper thing to do, then let's just change the law, and even the combat law.

I was going to ask you, what specific combat roles are there that you see that could not be handled by women, insofar as the Navy is concerned?

Admiral **Mack**. My own personal opinion, sir? I don't see anything a woman couldn't do that a man does now in the Navy. There are some physical things, such as SEAL's perhaps, where their physique is the key thing, being able to swim, or something of that sort, but there are women who can do that. You have only to see the Olympics.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. The Air Force had Micki King as a coach at the Academy there. She was a coach of the boys, and didn't create any problems at all. It was the greatest experience they ever had, and they came out of it with a lot better divers than they had before. So this isn't anything, again, that should be too difficult.

Admiral **Mack**. No, sir. I would have to search for an exception like that. Perhaps I could find one, but I don't think that's the point, because they can do almost anything.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. They certainly are beginning to prove it to me too.

I think, I agree with Mr. Montgomery, I don't know how soon this is going to happen, maybe in another year or two but, I think that it would be wise if the Academy did start figuring out what the actual cost would be for the changes that would have to be made, such as dormitory changes that would have to be made, and actually prepare a plan. The Air Force has a contingency plan. They know how much it's going to cost. They know how many they're going to bring in, and they're just going to have to do it if the Equal Rights Amendment is ever adopted by enough States. It's going to be a matter of rights. So they have a plan already, and it might be advisable for the Naval Academy to proceed on the same basis.

Admiral **Mack**. We have a series of plans.

Mr. **Fisher.** Admiral Bagley, did you have a comment with respect to that?

Adm. **David Bagley.** Yes; I have two comments, one with regard to Mr. Wilson's question.

He is correct. We have authorized a 30-percent waiver on the eyesight over the past several years. The reason for that is that we find a lot of people can do the unrestricted line job at sea in command as long as they have a 20-20 correctible. So you are correct on that, sir.

I might add also, since it has been brought up here about the number of women who might go to the Naval Academy, it may be of interest to the committee that at the present time the Naval Academy provides approximately 19 percent of the total unrestricted line input per year to the Navy. We are unique, as I know you all are familiar with, in that we have to provide seashore opportunity for our officers. We cannot send all the men to sea indefinitely and keep all the women ashore.

So I think that as we are considering this question, we should look at how many women can be taken into the Navy from the Academy, or any other source. We estimate that if the statutes are not changed and the women are denied combat duty, as has been defined here today, that we have approximately 1,600 billets that can be filled by women in the unrestricted line, and I am going on the presumption that the graduates of the Naval Academy should be all—or a very large majority of them—unrestricted line eligible.

As we are increasing the numbers of women, the Navy is becoming more attractive to them. They see a real opportunity to advance and more are staying in. So we are getting a larger career force to fill those 1,600 billets. If we do admit women to the Naval Academy and do not change the combat provisions of law we are going to have to restrict the number of women coming in, both from the Naval Academy and the ROTC.

Mr. **Fisher.** May I ask you one question? I am wondering how much weight we should give, in considering this subject, to the question of whether it's cost-effective to spend $62,000 a year to train a woman, or a man, or anybody else for noncombat, on restrictive duty. Is that good management? Is that a sound approach? And can we justify it?

Adm. **David Bagley.** It certainly is not a good investment, in my view, for a person who is going to be restricted in the assignment of his capabilities. We are getting a number of highly qualified women applicants for our OCS, which, it has been pointed out here, costs us about $7,000 per graduate. That will meet most of our needs. That, together with the programs we have in the ROTC, will meet our women requirements and still provide, in the case of the NROTC, a subsidized education.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Wilson, you had another question?

Mr. **Charles Wilson.** Mr. Hogan just answered it for me. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Treen?

Mr. **Treen.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to take just a moment to welcome my friend, Bill Middendorf, to commend him on his selection as Secretary of the Navy. I know that you are devoted to the mission of the Navy and that it's going to flourish under your guidance. I was very pleased that the President made that particular appointment.

Secretary MIDDENDORF. Thank you.

Mr. TREEN. I have a couple of questions for Admiral Mack, but anybody can respond who wishes to.

I refer you to the bottom of page 8 of your statement, Admiral Mack, and the top of page 9, in which you refer to the Naval Academy as a "fixed resource," and that Congress has set a ceiling on the total number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy.

What is that? Is that 4,200?

Admiral MACK. It's 4,444, plus Medal of Honor winners' sons, which might average half a dozen or more in future years. It would be roughly that number. We do not bring in that number because, as I said before, we only have 4,300 places to put people at any given time. So we bring in enough young men in the plebe year to make about 4,380 at the beginning of the summer, and the 80 either attrit or leave by the end of the plebe summer, and so we try to get it rounded to 4,300 as being our fixed ceiling in terms of facilities with which to educate and keep these young men. So 4,444 is the legal limit, plus or minus a few, and the practical limit is 4,300.

Mr. TREEN. So you try to bring in at the beginning of the plebe year a number that will give you approximately 4,380, is that correct?

Admiral MACK. 4,380 at the beginning of plebe summer. During that summer around 80 will leave.

Mr. TREEN. Why do they leave?

Admiral MACK. They leave for various reasons: They don't like the idea of being a naval officer finally, even though they've been there; they think it's too difficult for them; they've decided they want some other career. There are a variety of reasons, not all of them given being the proper true reason. Sometimes their families want them to become a midshipman, and they get there and decide they really don't want to, so they change their mind and leave. But we know historically about 80 will leave in the summertime.

Mr. TREEN. So your admission policy is geared to come out at about 4,300 at the beginning of the year?

Admiral MACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREEN. And that's what you have facilities for, approximately 4,300?

Admiral MACK. Yes; the number of bunks; the number of places in the messhall; the number of classroom seats; lavatories, and so forth.

Mr. TREEN. So you're operating at capacity, so to speak, now?

Admiral MACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREEN. I just want to pursue that point because I think that what you're saying in your statement is that you would have to reduce the number of men if you admit women.

Admiral MACK. Yes, sir; it's a very important point. I wish I had made it more strongly in the statement, but you brought it out again, that this is the key, we are fixed in size, if we do not find some way to increase the size. This would be very costly, I think. We're talking then in terms of building new buildings and new facilities. Our other recourse is to reduce the number of men and take in women, which would reduce the number of men going to fleet assignments.

Mr. **Treen**. Is this the particular situation every year? Is this the rule, rather than the exception, that you're operating at your authorized capacity?

Admiral **Mack**. We have been at this authorized capacity, I think, 8 to 10 years. The other two academies are coming up to the same capacity as ours, and they have only recently reached the 4,000 level.

Way back in the old days we had a 1,500 level, and that's when our gymnasium and other facilities were built. We went to 2,000, 2,400, and now we're up to 4,000, I think, it was around 8 years ago, something of that sort.

Mr. **Treen**. Admiral, as I understand your statement—and I consider it to be very comprehensive and concise—the burden of it is that as long as we have the combat restriction you do not favor admission of women to the Academy. If the law were changed, it is your opinion that women would have no difficulty doing all that a male admittee could do.

Are you referring to the career at the Academy when you state that a woman could perform any function that a man could, or do you mean throughout the naval career?

Admiral **Mack**. My responsibility, of course, is limited to the Naval Academy, and I could give you some personal opinion based on what I think would happen later.

I make a point though that, obviously, there are not as many physically capable women in our country as there are men, by virtue of the nature of what women do and what men do, and therefore there would be less of a pool to draw from. I am sure that we could get in the numbers we would need physically able and capable women to do whatever we have to do, just as we do men.

With regard to what they do outside of the fleet, there are many jobs involving physical stress, and so forth; there are many not involving it. That would be a judgment you would have to make, on what billet you were talking about, what the women could do, and there are many, many billets that could be filled by women in the fleet in combat roles.

Mr. **Treen**. I presume that during the 4-year course at the Academy marriage is prohibited for your students?

Admiral **Mack**. This is correct.

Mr. **Treen**. And that would presumably apply for women, if admitted?

Admiral **Mack**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Treen**. You would propose to prohibit the marriage for women graduates following their graduation, would you?

Admiral **Mack**. No, sir.

Mr. **Treen**. That would be untenable, of course.

Admiral **Mack**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Treen**. To prohibit it after they graduate.

Admiral **Mack**. Yes, sir. It has been historically. Of course, when I was a midshipman there was a law saying, "You cannot be married for 2 years after graduation."

Mr. **Treen**. Now you marry them right at graduation time, don't you?

Admiral **Mack**. The same day, yes, sir.

Mr. **Treen**. Then if they get married, obviously some of them are going to have children. After they get out, during their career in the Navy, the women will have children.

Admiral **Mack**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Treen**. What are we going to do about when they get pregnant, and they're out at sea, and so forth? Are we going to have a special maternity leave, or do you feel at that time a woman might not be able to perform as adequately as a man, during pregnancy periods?

Admiral **Mack**. Fortunately, we have a very good Chief of Naval Personnel who would have to solve all these problems. I think you better address that to him.

Mr. **Treen**. I was wondering whether you'd give them maternity leave, or send the husband out to the fleet so that he could be there when it was born.

I don't intend to be entirely humorous here. I think that I'm trying to point to the problem, that you don't have this problem, of course, during Academy life, or you wouldn't have it with a woman because she's prohibited from marrying, just as a man is. But once she gets out into the service as a career, the woman bears children, and that's a natural phenomenon, and I don't know that anyone's suggesting that that be changed, or how it would be changed. But it seems to me that that fact of life certainly creates a problem. I'm not saying that it's not a natural problem, and I haven't decided how I'm going to vote on this legislation, but I'm probing and I'm being the devil's advocate from time to time.

But it seems to me that we do, by the very fact that the women will be bearing children, have this problem, that it will derogate to that extent from the full utilization of our career officers. That is going to have to be taken care of in some way if it happens.

I personally am opposed to utilizing women in combat. I don't think that drawing that distinction is an invidious discrimination or an inequity at all, but that's another problem.

Does anyone have any suggestions as to how this maternity problem might be handled during the carrer of these naval officers?

Adm. **Worth Bagley**. I think, just to make a related comment that's important, you've drawn a very valid distinction here between the difficulties that might exist between the training period and the difficulties that might exist subsequently when the individual went into the fleet.

We've had a great deal of discussion about the cost of facilities at the Naval Academy, but we haven't talked about the facility changes that would be required in the fleet itself. If the law were altered so that a woman graduate would be assigned to a combatant ship, there is a great deal of change that would be required there to accommodate the two sexes.

Mr. **Treen**. In addition to that, if a woman becomes pregnant you're going to have to take her out at some point of her pregnancy, the third month, fourth month, I don't know, and what provisions are going to be made for these difficult times during the pregnancy? What problems are these going to create for the Navy? It's certainly kind of a difficult thing to predict, at least it's been my experience, and I'm just wondering if there's been some thought as to how this was going to be managed. I suppose not—and I don't want to take up too much of the committee's time—because you're not really considering changing the law or permitting women in combat.

Adm. **Worth Bagley.** That's correct.

Mr. **Treen.** And I don't suggest that you should, as you suggest, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher.** Vice Admiral Bagley, I think, would like to address this.

Adm. **David Bagley.** We have, of course, this problem in the Navy today. You're perfectly correct, Mr. Treen, that we would have to remove them from the ship. With respect to our experience today ashore, we are looking to giving people about 1 month before birth and six weeks after birth before they return to their assigned duties, so it does represent a longer time away from the job than it does for the male.

Mr. **Treen.** Well, it's a considerably different problem at sea than it is here.

Adm. **David Bagley.** It would be, from my point of view, as Chief of Naval Personnel, a very difficult problem, because I would have to have reliefs available on shore to go out on very short notice to relieve pregnant women on board ship.

Mr. **Treen.** Yes. Thank you, Admiral.

Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Hillis, if you will bear with me, and let me ask the admiral one other question just to keep it in context here.

You commented on it briefly a moment ago, and that's the first time that had been referred to, the problem of converting the ships, or making such changes that might be required to accommodate women if they are assigned to combat on the ships.

Would you enlarge on that, and how much difficulty would be involved in converting the ships, or making the changes?

Adm. **Worth Bagley.** I think it's the same sort of problem that Admiral Mack raised for the Naval Academy, but it's multiplied. We have at the end of this year 509 combat ships in the Navy, so we would make the same sort of conversions to accommodate the two sexes, and we'd multiply that times 509. It's that scope of a problem.

Mr. **Fisher.** Would that be fairly expensive?

Adm. **Worth Bagley.** It would be very expensive, I would judge, but I haven't gotten into this in detail. But on the face of this, it would be.

Mr. **Fisher.** Admiral, I won't pursue it further here because I want to have room for Mr. Hillis to ask questions. He always asks real good ones. Would you submit for the record at some point an estimate of the cost and what would be involved in that? I think the committee would want to know.

Adm. **Worth Bagley.** We'll do the best we can on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher.** Thank you very much.

[The following information was received for the record:]

AN ANALYSIS OF THE COST IMPACT OF INTEGRATING WOMEN INTO THE MANNING OF ALL ACTIVE SHIPS, AIRCRAFT SQUADRONS AND U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

ASSUMPTIONS

1. The Equal Rights Amendment is passed and fully implemented by the U.S. Navy.
2. The ability of women to perform combat duties effectively is equal to that of men.

3. All Navy assignments will be open to women.
4. The Navy will be able to recruit the numbers of women it desires and/or requires.
5. Personnel support, excluding facilities, will be the same as currently experienced. (Disbursing, medical, recreational, etc.)
6. Changes made to facilities will be permanent and of high quality.

It should also be noted that cost impact on future construction was not considered. The total cost of alterations to ships and facilities was used; therefore, time phasing of changes was not considered. Readiness changes have not been quantified. Reserve ships were not included in the analysis.

DISCUSSION

Ships

Costs connected with modifying active Navy ships to accommodate women crew members include primarily structural modifications to berthing and sanitary spaces. Examples of work that would have to be performed are: partitioning berthing and sanitary spaces; altering ventilation and lighting to serve new spaces; erecting bulkheads to provide passageways through berthing areas. In this analysis, changes to work spaces, decor, messing spaces and medical facilities were not considered.

Because of the overall limitation of space aboard ships any additional space required for alterations to accommodate women would be at the expense of spaces now allocated to other functions.

In undertaking this analysis, structural modifications were developed for each of eight representative ships and the costs associated with making changes in each of these ships were assessed. All other Navy ships were then categorized under one of the representative ships to which it was most nearly related.

The tables below show the ships which were analyzed, the cost for altering each ship the number of active Navy ships considered to be in that category and the total cost. A range of values was applied to show the extent of changes required if women crew members represented 4%, (presently planned percent of women in the Navy by FY-76), 10% and 20% of the crew, respectively. FY-76 force levels and costs were used. Absolute numbers of women represented would be approximately 21,000, 54,000 and 108,000.

It should be noted that the numbers of ships associated with each representative type are not necessarily the numbers that will be in that type but rather represent the number of ships in which similar modifications would have to be made.

4 PERCENT WOMEN CREW MEMBERS

Ships	Representative costs (thousands)	Number of ships	Total cost (millions)
1. AD 38 (destroyer tender)	$164	56	$9.2
2. AOR 7 (oiler)	77	19	1.5
3. CVAN 68 (aircraft carrier)	70	13	.9
4. DE 1052 (destroyer escort)	98	201	19.7
5. LST 1179 (landing ship, tank)	185	66	12.2
6. PF (patrol frigate)	105	11	1.2
7. SSBN (ballistic missile submarine)	420	122	51.2
Total			95.9

10 PERCENT WOMEN CREW MEMBERS

Ships	Representative costs (thousands)	Number of ships	Total cost (millions)
1. AD 38 (destroyer tender)	$134	56	$7.5
2. AOR 7 (oiler)	84	19	1.6
3. CVAN 68 (aircraft carrier)	49	13	.6
4. DE 1052 (destroyer escort)	154	201	31.0
5. LST 1179 (landing ship, tank)	162	66	10.7
6. PF (patrol frigate)	98	11	1.1
7. SSBN (ballistic missile submarine)	490	122	59.8
Total			112.3

20 PERCENT WOMEN CREW MEMBERS

Ships	Representative costs (thousands)	Number of ships	Total cost (millions)
1. AD 38 (destroyer tender)	$122	56	6.8
2. AOR 7 (oiler)	84	19	1.6
3. CVAN 68 (aircraft carrier)	28	13	.4
4. DE 1052 (destroyer escort)	168	201	33.8
5. LST 1179 (landing ship, tank)	168	66	11.1
6. PF (patrol frigate)	119	11	1.3
7. SSBN (ballistic missile submarine)	630	122	76.9
Total			131.9

As demonstrated by the tables, cost of ship modifications is not necessarily a linear function. In some cases, larger numbers of women on board will require fewer modifications since whole berthing areas may be devoted to women instead of making extensive alterations to provide separate berthing for men and women within an existing compartment.

Cost data for ship modifications were developed by the Naval Ship Engineering Center and the Naval Ship Systems Command.

Aircraft

It is reasonable to postulate that sufficient women will be available for assignment to aircrew billets who have the same human engineering characteristics (i.e., mean height, weight, reach, dexterity, etc.), as their male counterparts and, therefore, would be able to adequately function without extensive modifications to aircraft. Male height and weight standards required for entry into the flight program range from 64 inches (min. weight 105, max. weight 160) to 78 inches (min. 153 to max. 235). Approximately 85% of the young women of the country fall within these physical standard limits. Should the Navy be unable to find the requisite number of such women, and the number to be integrated were an absolute requirement, extensive and very costly cockpit and control modifications might be required for nearly all combat aircraft. The total cost of integrating women into the fleet could thus become significantly higher than that associated with changes to shipboard accommodations.

U.S. Naval Academy (USNA)

The costs developed for changes required at USNA are made up of two parts. First, those changes required to be made to Bancroft Hall Dormitory sanitary space. For numbers up to 300 women midshipmen (7% of the 4200 total) existing janitorial lockers could be converted at the cost of $5000 each. For increases beyond 300, three-person rooms would have to be modified to add sanitary spaces at the cost of $4000 per room.

The second part of the analysis considered changes to the Bancroft Hall Dispensary to accommodate female patients.

Although modification costs mentioned in the above paragraphs are, in general, one-time costs, the costs of modifying the Dispensary would be the same for all sizes of woman population. If numbers of patients exceed the Dispensary capacity, overflow would be accommodated at the Naval Hospital, as is presently done for male midshipmen.

The table below summarizes the costs estimated for altering USNA facilities to accommodate women.

Percent of women integrated	Percent of women	Cost modifications to Bancroft Hall	Cost of modifications to dispensary	Total
4	168	$50,000	$15,000	$65,000
10	420	250,000	15,000	265,000
20	840	810,000	15,000	825,000

U.S. Naval Academy Public Works Department developed cost estimates for the USNA modifications.

An Appraisal of the Impact of Integrating Women into the U.S. Naval Academy and Aboard Ship

The repeal of legislation prohibiting women from serving aboard combat ships and aircraft and the admission of women to the U.S. Naval Academy (USNA) appear to be relatively simple mechanical problems. After all, if women are expected to assume a combat role, there should be little difficulty in integrating them into USNA life. The coeducational adjustments would be far easier to accommodate in the academic environment than would be possible in the fleet because of the isolated existence secular to shipboard life. However, if sociological pressures preclude combat assignments, then more than a token number of women at the Naval Academy could degrade the institution's ability to educate and train officers for combat. In any event, there are ample opportunities within the NROTC program for women to attain an education in naval science and a commission in the Navy.

The role of women aboard ship poses vastly different problems in terms of sociological, psychological and readiness implications. Most professional officers and, particularly, USNA alumni are adamant in their disbelief that such a change is either feasible or desirable. Acceptance of this wider role for women by society, by Navy men, and by Navy women themselves would be crucial to its success. The complexion of the entire Navy would have to change considerably.

One essential decision will have to be made by the Navy: will women be *permitted* to go to sea or will they be *required* to go to sea? If they are permitted, not required, to serve on sea duty, a number of unequal opportunity problems will arise. Men are ordered to sea but women may volunteer. Limiting women to billets ashore already prompts a perception among men in some ratings that their sea duty is extended because shore billets are made scarce by assignment of women. If ships have been modified to accommodate women and fewer than the required numbers volunteer to go to sea, additional manning problems will be created.

On the other hand, if women are required to go to sea, then, ignoring for the moment the sociological and psychological considerations of men and women stationed together aboard ship, the Navy's ability to recruit women who desire sea duty must be considered. The Navy has been very successful in recruiting high caliber women. If the women's role is substantially changed, then the Navy's ability to recruit and retain qualified women may well be altered. The numbers of women who could be lured by the romance of a seafaring life might be relatively small. Therefore, the talented women the Navy attracts now could well be lost to one of the other services.

Explanations for why women might not desire to go to sea, why men might not wish them there and, more important, why the families of both might find the situation intolerable lie deeply within our historical culture.

Going to sea and organized combat are two of the oldest endeavors of civilized man. Traditionally, either by social custom or by the demand for physical strength, these fields have been open only to men. In the 16th century, when armed combat and the sea-going profession were welded into the first standing Navy, the product was predictably male dominated.

Since the inception of the Continental Navy, later the U.S. Navy, traditional male domination of warfare and seafaring has continued. Only recently has there been pressure for change. The naval profession—specifically the business of going to sea—has been advertised as, and accepted as, a closed club for men.

The present male-dominated, sea-going facet of Navy life, is one that is understood and accepted by the country and the men in the Navy. Men join the Navy for many different reasons; however, a certain portion join and remain in the Navy because they enjoy being in a job which has been historically associated with fellowship among men in a difficult and dangerous endeavor. Changing the fabric of the Navy by integration women into all combat roles might well reduce the attractions of the Navy to this segment of mankind, as well as to some of those men who might, in the future, join the Navy and make it a career.

As long as the Navy is able, as it presently is, to fill its quota of enlistees from the male population, the basic rationale for male-female integration aboard ships and in aircraft squadrons becomes difficult to support if the integration would cause a significant problem to the Navy in terms of readiness, morale, discipline or image.

In addition to the reactions and perceptions of Navy men and women, it is important to consider the reactions and perceptions of their families. The prospect of long deployments with mixed crews could be viewed with some degree of uneasiness by spouses of crew members. If this occurred, morale and readiness would certainly be affected. Even single members might find that families and friends do not support this new role for Navy women. Traditional elements of the population are certain to find problems understanding and dealing with this concept.

In summary, if the Navy is to change its policy, we cannot have it both ways. The Navy must either support the mixed crew concept or the traditional all-male approach. A permissive approach toward women at sea (i.e., volunteers only) could create intolerable inequities. Both segments of the population must be treated equally in terms of sea/shore rotation, for example, if women do go to sea.

The larger question deals with whether or not the mainstream of American society would support the concept of women in combat. Since the primary mission of Navy ships is preparedness to defend the country in war against our enemies, assigning women to combat billets is prima facie evidence that the Navy and the Congress accept a combat role for women.

The present wave of breaking down the barrier between the sexes is good and is long overdue in sports, education, government and the white collar professions. However, the waging of war is by its nature different and requires professional attributes and characteristics which are the antithesis of what we in this society consider essentially feminine qualities. To make a precipitous change in this area ignores both biological and psychological differences and may by its very novelty threaten national security at a time when our country may already be only marginally defended.

Since the role of the Navy is to defend the people of this country, it seems that it must be the people's decision as to whether they want women to bear arms. In the absence of such a mandate from the people as conveyed by the Congress, the Navy would be presumptuous to open combat roles to women.

Mr. Fisher. Excuse me, Mr. Hillis. Go right ahead.

Mr. Hillis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I've enjoyed all the testimony this morning. I apologize for being a few minutes late.

Most of the questions I had have already been asked and were adequately answered, and I think the information is already in the record.

I am concerned somewhat, however. I would like to ask how many women do we have in total in the Navy at this time?

Secretary Middendorf. About 12,000.

Adm. David Bagley. At the end of this month we expect to have 1,067 officers and 13,176 enlisted.

Mr. Hillis. And I believe you intimated that 13,000 will increase to 26,000 or 27,000, is that correct?

Secretary Middendorf. There are some nurses also.

Mr. Hillis. Does this include nurses?

Adm. David Bagley. No; these are unrestricted line officers.

Mr. Hillis. I see. And the 1,067, then 50 percent or half again, roughly 1,500, 1,600?

Adm. David Bagley. We have, counting the health professions, with the doctors, dentists, and nurses, a total of 3,544 commissioned officers, which gives you an indication of how many of these women officers are in the nursing profession.

Mr. Hillis. How many women officers will be coming to you through ROTC, do you know offhand, and how many ROTC enrollees you might have at the present time?

Adm. Worth Bagley. I think we have 30 in the scholarship program and 133 in the college program, and the 30 will increase to 60 over the next 2 years, and the 133 will increase to 400 over the same period, in total.

Mr. Hillis. Is it contemplated that for these people you will have kind of a female professional-officer course? Some of these women will stay on for a full career, will they not?

The point I'm getting to is, your needs are being satisfied by relatively low numbers, say, in the ROTC program. Isn't it conceivable that if women were admitted to the Academy and the Congress doesn't change the combat requirement, which I predict they will not, that the need for female officers going to the Academy would be relatively low in billets taken?

Admiral Mack. I would think that would be true, sir. On the other hand, the law the way it reads, we would have no method of restricting the input, and we might suddenly end up with a thousand women in one of our 1,400-man classes and be overwhelmed, because there's no provision in the law at the moment to restrict the number we took in.

Adm. Worth Bagley. One point I made earlier, and I think it's worth repeating now: We would have one restriction, looking at the continuing need of officers in combatant ships, and that's the money. It would be $62,000 in the Naval Academy, $21,000 in the ROTC scholarship program and $7,000 in OCS, so that would be the type of control that we would have to pay attention to in looking at combatant and noncombatant officer needs.

Mr. Hillis. Yes, I appreciate that, because that was one of the questions I had planned to ask.

Secretary Middendorf. Could I add to that, Mr. Hillis?

Mr. Hillis. Yes.

Secretary Middendorf. Admiral Mack made a point that without the change in the combat role permitted women, every lady who comes into the Naval Academy will replace, must replace, a combat officer, or potential combat officer, if the law is not changed.

We checked with Princeton yesterday. We talked to the associate director of admissions, and we asked his experience there. The first year that women were admitted, about 5 years ago I understand, they started out with a quota and it quickly was outlawed, and the number of women enrolled immediately, in 5 years, went from 135 women to 624 women and to 1,500 men.

So if that were a typical experience, and I think it would be, then there would be no question—whether it's right or wrong, that's not the question—there's no question in my mind that the practical outcome would be that very shortly Naval Academy enrollment would be approaching the national average between the two sexes. If there were 4,400 men and women allowed in, there could be all sorts of lawsuits trying to determine why at least the women weren't proportionately represented. That's a possibility. I don't say it's inevitable but certainly it's been true for the colleges.

Mr. Hillis. This is certainly a point for consideration. However, there are those advocates who say that even if ERA is adopted, that the Congress of the United States will still have the right to make the policy of who serves the country and who doesn't, and I would think that this might carry over to the admission to the academies as well. However, this is unplowed ground, so to speak, and neither one of us knows what will happen. If ERA passes, I'm sure there are going to be a lot of problems, and problems whether we change this law or not.

Assuming it does not, going back to my original line, it's conceivable that the ability of the Academy to meet the needs of the female officer could be 50, or 75, or 100, is that right? You may not be talking in large numbers, is that not correct?

Admiral MACK. I think that's right, sir. What you would do, it would seem to me, would be to take the number of restricted line officer women, which is 1,600, put that in ratio against the number of unrestricted line officers in the Navy, and then the same ratio against 4,000 midshipmen, and I believe you'd come out something like a hundred in the Academy at any one time, or 25 per class; something of that sort, which would be the most that should be allowed, because otherwise you would overdo the input into the number which is allowed for women and you would end up with an imbalance. Also, we presume that 100 percent would come from the Academy. Now, if you don't want that, you could even do with a lesser number in the Naval Academy.

Mr. HILLIS. Assume you had 25 per class. What's this going to do, as far as the long line of facilities that you were talking about, the maximization of your facilities? Would you be able to operate with an extra 25?

Admiral MACK. With 25 in each class? Again, that would simply be 25 less men who would go to the fleet. Although obviously you can put 25 extra people in a 4,000-man complex with a little shoehorning, you can't shoehorn women quite as easily as men. You end up with a little trouble there. I think, of course, that could be handled.

The Secretary was making the point, of course, that under the present law there's no way that we see that you could limit the numbers to end up with 25 women, because that would be putting a quota in, which would be another form of discrimination. That would be very difficult to do under the present law, and unless there would be some provision made to limit the numbers, according to each class. Otherwise, we could be swamped with the numbers, as the Secretary has pointed out.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Wilson, do you have any other questions?

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Just one, Mr. Chairman.

In connection with this last answer you gave, Admiral, again, I can't see why you're going to be getting more women than what you can handle—that you'll get overloaded. They still have to be nominated, by either congressional nomination, or one of the other ways of nomination. I'm assuming that they are going to have to compete on the same basis as the males who will be nominated, that the same criteria that you use now in selecting males would be used in determining between men or women, and I just don't agree that this presents any great problem.

I think you're saying it could possibly do it, but I really don't believe there's going to be that many nominations. I think there may be a large number to begin with.

Admiral MACK. Mr. Wilson, of course I'm making an assumption, which perhaps I shouldn't, but I'm basing it on the fact that this year, with no law and no possibility of having this happen, we have 12 nominations of women now by Members of the Congress, and this, of course, would be up to Members of the Congress. I would think that if the law were changed that each one would have one or two nominees, because I'm sure there's a backlog of very competent young women who want to do this, and every Congressman would seize upon the chance to nominate, and the numbers involved might be very high.

I'm sure that's a speculation I'm making.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. One other thing, Mr. Chairman, and then I will stop.

But you have no objection to women going into the ROTC program, and yet the ROTC does furnish a significant number of your combat officers. I assume the curriculum is the same for men and women in the ROTC program, isn't it?

Admiral **Mack**. Yes, it is. However, ROTC can be expanded or contracted very easily, and there are not fixed resources, say, in the University of California, whereas there are at the Naval Academy, so therefore you can't contract and expand. OCS inputs can also be easily controlled.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. I was just wondering, if you have no objection to them in the ROTC, why there should be any objection at the Academy. Apparently the principal problem that you see is this law that prohibits them from being in combat, and whether this would require a change in the mission of the Academy itself. Even there, we're always updating the curriculum, I would think, and changing it from time to time, just to keep in touch with the times.

So, again, I think that we may be creating more problems than our real problems in trying to find a solution to this.

Admiral **Mack**. Mr. Wilson, we are updating the curriculum. We change and update frequently. But this would be a large change, where almost half of what the midshipman now takes would have to be redone, and put in a different context so that a woman could have what she needed. That's a very large change and requires a lot of work to do, and, even though it's a few people who would be involved, 25 or 50, but if it were a large number of young women this would require changes in the mix of the faculty, and many other things which would change there.

We are making the point, I think, that if there are large numbers of women at the Naval Academy, not only does this happen, but the main thing is they would be a substitute for men who would be vitally needed in the naval fleet to run our ships, and it would reduce our readiness.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. Thank you very much.

Mr. **Fisher**. Admiral, would you add to your statement for the record, if you can, an estimate of the costs that would be involved in changing the curriculum, as you have indicated, to accommodate women, in view of the fact that they are not eligible for combat roles under existing law?

Admiral **Mack**. I certainly can, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. If you could give us an estimate, I think it might be interesting.

Admiral **Mack**. Yes, sir.

[The following information was received for the record:]

An estimate of the costs that would accrue as a result of curriculum and summer program changes to accommodate women in view of the fact that they are not eligible for combat roles under existing law is as follows:

A. Summer Cruises.

1. Third Class cruise revised as follows:

Six to eight weeks at a naval station performing various enlisted functions such as basic housekeeping and maintenance chores, security, clerical training, communications training, etc. The cruise objective would be to become exposed to Navy enlisted life ashore.

Estimated cost.—$300.00 (per woman for transportation and per diem).

2. Second Class cruise revised as follows:

Six to eight weeks duration, consisting of orientation visits of about one week each to diverse naval support facilities, i.e., naval shipyard, weapons test range, R&D facility, air support command, fleet training center, communications center, supply center.

Estimated cost.—$800.00 (per woman for transportation and per diem).

3. First Class cruise revised as follows: Six to eight weeks assigned to a major shore command or headquarters in a junior officer training capacity.

Estimated cost.—$300.00 (per woman for transportation and per diem).

Total Cost for Summer Training: $1400.00 per woman.

NOTE. This total cost of summer training would be less if viewed in the light that women would replace men at the Academy and therefore some amount of cost would be saved by the reduced number of men participating in the cruises as now conducted.

B. Academic Courses.

1. The following professional courses would be deleted from the female professional program since they are directly supportive of shipboard billets:

NS101—Fundamentals of Naval Science.
EW102—Introduction to Engineering and Weapons Systems.
NN201—Navigation I.
NN202—Navigation II.
EN200—Naval Engineering I.
EN301—Naval Engineering II.
EW301—Shipboard Weaponeering.
NS302—Operations and Tactics II.

2. The following courses would be substituted in the curriculum for the above courses:

The Naval Shore Establishment: Mission and Organization.
Naval Research and Development Programs.
Naval Supply System.
Personnel Management.
Data System Management.
Military Budgeting and Procurement.
Military Affairs and Foreign Policy.
Naval Ship, Aircraft and Weapon System Orientation.

All of the above are new three-semester-hour courses that would have to be added to the curriculum. On a faculty load basis of 12 semester hours per instructor, three instructors would have to be added to the faculty.

Estimated cost.—$16,000 per faculty member = $48,000.

C. Total cost estimate for revised summer and academic program assuming *20 women* per class for a *four-year* period:

Academic	$192,000
Summer training	28,000
Total	220,000

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hogan, our counsel, has a question.

Mr. HOGAN. Admiral, the question was answered by you that if the statutory restrictions on combat were repealed that you would be able to assimilate women into the Academy rather rapidly.

How much difficulty would the Navy have with preparing the fleet to accept them for summer training, in the way of time?

We should have in the record some estimate of how soon the fleet could take women for summer training under those circumstances.

Admiral MACK. I assume, sir, that we would have time, since summer training does not happen until the succeeding summer. We'd have time to do that.

Mr. HOGAN. Right.

Admiral MACK. Summer training now takes place on a variety of ships, and the majority of it for the first year, on LPD's, which are large amphibious ships, where the main part of that ship is berthing, and sleeping, and so forth. That sort of thing lends itself to change. You can put in partitions, and so forth, relatively easily.

However, in the succeeding years, a large part of the midshipman training is done in fleet ships, carriers. In other words, the first class would go to sea in carriers, in all kinds of ships. That would be more difficult. That would be down the road 3 years.

Just looking at the first year, this would not be extremely difficult, and perhaps we could handle it within the time frame we have. There would be some expense to it. But presumably, if this were happening you'd meet some expense eventually anyway, since women would be serving in these ships. This would be something that you'd have to do eventually anyway.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Secretary, considering the testimony of Admiral Mack this morning and the ability of the Academy to take women if the statutes were repealed, is it still the position of the Navy—besides your personal view, which we have on the record—that you oppose the admission of women to the Naval Academy?

Secretary MIDDENDORF. Well, if Congress can change the role of women, we'll obey orders, and do a terrific job doing it.

Mr. HOGAN. I understand that, Mr. Secretary. But would the position of the Navy remain the same if the statutes were repealed?

Secretary MIDDENDORF. I'm not sure I know what you mean, Bill.

Mr. HOGAN. Would you continue to oppose the admission of women to the Naval Academy?

Secretary MIDDENDORF. If the law were changed, I don't think at that point we'd be in a position to.

I did want to say this, though. I think Mrs. Holt referred to sort of a dual training curriculum. I don't think that it would be legally proper for us to set up dual training at the Naval Academy. It would discriminate against those men who could not take that noncombat training and who might desire to take it. Further, it would have a corrosive effect on the esprit de corps, if some people were taking noncombat training at the Academy while the remainder were required to take combat training.

In other words, the girls would be given preferential treatment, in that sense, if, indeed, we did go into a dual training mode.

When I expressed my personal views about there being a potential reduction in the training standards, what I meant was a reduction in the combat training capabilities. I think it would be harmful to the security of the country.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you all, and let me say in conclusion that the committee would welcome additional statements from any who are present, and, without objection, they will be admitted into the record, and we also welcome any enlargement on your views on any matter, if it occurs that you might need to expand or enlighten us further on any point that's been raised.

I emphasize that we're trying to make a complete, informative record on this, and we're very pleased with the assistance you've given us here this morning. It's been very productive.

Thank you.

Secretary **Middendorf**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. We'll recess until next Tuesday.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m., to reconvene on Tuesday, June 18, 1974.]

[The following information was received for the record:]

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD BY VICE ADM. WILLIAM P. MACK, U.S. NAVY, SUPERINTENDENT, U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

I should like to emphasize for the record the central issue involved in the admission of women to the Naval Academy so long as those women continue to be excluded from combat roles under existing law. As I have previously stated, *the* mission of the United States Naval Academy is to train officers for a combat role in the Navy and Marine Corps. At the current moment in our country's history, the attractiveness of a career in the restricted line and staff corps of the Navy offers lively competition to a career in the unrestricted line which thrives on the challenges and rigors of life and duty at sea but which entails more extensive family separations than do the shore-oriented specialties of the Navy. Accordingly, the Naval Academy must assiduously marshal its resources to promote and maintain the interest of its midshipmen in a career in the unrestricted line. To this end, the Academy devotes painstaking care and effort to create an esprit de corps conducive to a career in the unrestricted line communities—surface, air, and submarine. Anything which derogates from an unrestricted line orientation is to be discouraged. The admission of women into a non-combatant program would constitute a derogation from the stated objective, not only because of a diminished male line officer output but also because such a program would sanctify, within the Naval Academy itself, a highly visible alternative to the unrestricted line career option—the promotion of which must remain the paramount objective of the Naval Academy in order to ensure continuation of the Academy's vital manpower input to the Fleet. A two-track system—one track for men and one for women—would be highly deleterious to the accomplishment of the Naval Academy's primary mission.

It has been implied that the Naval Academy already has a two-track system because we commission a small number of officers each year in the restricted line and staff corps. Such is not the case. This small number of officers is composed almost entirely of young men who, during their four years at the Academy, develop some physical condition which renders them ineligible for a commission in the unrestricted line but does not preclude their rendering useful service in the restricted line or staff corps, including service at sea. The same is true of the small number of exceptional young men admitted to the Naval Academy with minor visual defects which are not in consonance with unrestricted line standards. These young men pursue the same curriculum as their counterparts who have no physical disqualification, in preparation for the day when they may expect to go to sea in their restricted capacity or into combat. There simply does not exist at the Naval Academy a non-combatant "track" for midshipmen whose physical disqualifications render them ineligible for an unrestricted line commission.

The question has arisen concerning the effect which the repeal of the prohibition against the utilization of women in combat roles would have upon the Naval Academy and the Navy. As I have stated, repeal of the prohibition would alleviate a very serious—although not totally insurmountable—problem with regard to the admission of women to the Naval Academy, viz., the necessity of a two-track system. The effect of repealing the prohibition would, however, have a far different impact on the Navy as a whole. The costs to the Navy in sending women to sea, in terms of money and personnel management, are documented elsewhere in the record. Also, despite the fact that some women could withstand the rigors of almost any combat role the Navy might assign, there remains a serious question as to whether women qualified for those roles would be available in numbers large enough to warrant removal of the prohibition. Moreover, I doubt that the people of the United States wish women to go into combat. Therefore, despite my belief that some women could perform many combat roles as well as men, I am personally and philosophically opposed to the repeal of the statute which precludes their use in combat roles in the Navy, at sea and in the air. So, too, am I opposed to the admission of women to the Naval Academy without repeal of the restrictions on their assignability to sea and air roles. Therefore, I must conclude that the all-male admissions policy which presently obtains at the Naval Academy is correct, now and for the foreseeable future."

STATEMENT OF VICE ADM. BAGLEY WORTH, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

I would like to express my views, as Chief of Naval Personnel, for your consideration of the question whether women should be admitted to the U.S. Naval Academy.

We have a difficult problem today generated by our ongoing program to reduce by 10,000 the officers in the Navy to a projected total of 63,000 by the end of FY 1977. In the transition to a smaller Navy we must reduce our annual officer accessions as well as reduce the numbers in senior grades. Declining officer levels make even more important the full utilization of Unrestricted Line (URL) officers both at sea and ashore.

Illustrative of the reduced accessions is the fact that in FY 1975 we are planning a total of 7,105 of which about 4,080 will be Unrestricted Line (URL) officers. The annual Naval Academy input to the unrestricted line runs about 750 which would represent something over 18% of the total URL accessions during the next fiscal year. That percentage will increase as we reduce accessions in moving to our 63,000 goal and is projected to be 21% for FY 1977. The NROTC (Scholarship) input averages about 900 to 950 per year and the NROTC (College) about 200. The remainder of the approximately 4,080 URL accessions come from a variety of sources including the OCS (men and women) and aviation officer candidate programs. 3,895 of the approximately 4,080 accessions are required to be males to meet the requirements of combat forces. 10 USC 6015 prohibits assignment of women to naval vessels and aircraft with combat missions. Accordingly, only 185 of the URL accessions could be women. If women are authorized for admission to the Naval Academy, some quota control will have to be exercised if we are going to meet our combatant force requirements. The result would be a relatively low number of women who could be accepted in the subsidized programs at the Naval Academy and the NROTC (Scholarship). If both of those programs were to include women, the numbers would become little more than tokenism.

In order to maximize the utilization of the decreasing numbers of officers, we have instituted a program called the Operational/Technical/Managerial System (OTMS) which, for URL officers, provides basic professional education at sea and the development of a subspecialty in the technical and managerial areas which is deepened by repeat tours to billets in the chosen subspecialty during shore tours. The shore tours for male officers are needed to give them a reasonable amount of time at home with family. Presuming they cannot be assigned to combatant units, the more women we have the less average time a male officer will have ashore. If male officers were forced to spend more time at sea, especially in junior ranks, our retention rates would be adversely affected. To maintain present sea-shore rotation for lieutenants and below (six to seven years at sea during the first ten years of service), it is estimated that we can provide only 1,600 URL billets for women officers. We expect to have the requisite number to fill those 1,600 billets by the end of FY 1977. Subsequent annual woman officer accessions to maintain the 1,600 level cannot be accurately predicted at this time because they will depend upon retention rates and other variables.

The case is often made that women officers can compete very effectively with men in the restricted line and Staff Corps communities. These communities include such diverse elements as lawyers, chaplains, doctors and civil engineers in the Staff Corps and intelligence, public affairs, engineering and aeronautical engineering duty in the restricted line. Greater utilization of women in these areas is indeed feasible but the opportunity for significant increase is not bright at this time because of the decreasing size of our officer crops and the need to balance the decreased accessions between males and females to ensure sufficient male officers in each category to meet our needs in ships, aircraft squadrons and the seabees.

I have described quite briefly some of the constraints placed upon me as the personnel manager which militate against adding greatly to the numbers of women officers in the Navy today and who can be commissioned in the years ahead. I hope the discussion does show that acceptance of women at the Naval Academy, in absence of a repeal of the statutes prohibiting their assignment to combat units, would have to be finitely controlled. Such controls can be applied but there are obvious legal and political considerations which should be fully considered. To advocate admission of women to the Naval Academy as equal treatment under the law is one thing. For me to say that there are no billets to which women graduates may be assigned is obviously untenable. However, to rationalize their admission on these premises ignores the fact that the number admitted would have to be restricted to such a small quantity that it would represent noncompliance with the principle of equal opportunity and be neither a practical nor desirable course to follow.

I believe it would be useful also to review some constraints placed on officer personnel management should women be assigned to sea duty. For example, in assigning women to a destroyer, we would have to assign three junior women officers to each because the junior officer staterooms have been designed to accommodate that number. When one of those officers is detached from that ship, another woman must replace her in order to utilize the available berthing to maintain manning level. Because of limited living space on combatant ships, there is little privacy, even for officers.

The matter of pregnancy should be considered, too in that we could not keep a woman officer onboard ship for very long after the start of pregnancy. It is impossible to determine how many cases of this kind would occur but it would necessitate holding some women officers replacements readily available for short notice reassignment. I urge your consideration of the factors set forth in this statement. The Navy, as you know, is unique among the Services in that we have many small units such as destroyers, with small officer complements. The austere living accommodations and the very limited space available in a combatant ship cannot be readily modified to berth one or two women officers without reducing available berths. Another factor is that separation from family, inherent in Navy life, would virtually prohibit married women officers with children from serving at sea and would introduce a whole new set of assignment factors for a woman officer married to a male officer. Would they be ordered to the same ship or aircraft squadron?

The Navy can and will comply with any laws affecting women in the Service but at this time I would offer the caution to go slowly for it is going to be an expensive proposition in terms of educating women at the Academy and modification of facilities to accommodate them in ships. Increased numbers of women officers will also create problems in the effective management of the officer corps which cannot help but affect readiness of combat units under existing laws.

House of Representatives,
Committee on Armed Services,
Subcommittee No. 2,
Washington, D.C., Tuesday, June 18, 1974.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:10 a.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. O. C. Fisher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. **Fisher**. The subcommittee will come to order.

Today we continue our hearings on the admission of women to the service academies, and have as our witnesses Dr. John L. McLucas, Secretary of the Air Force; Gen. George S. Brown, Chief of Staff of the Air Force; and Lt. Gen. A. P. Clark, Superintendent of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

General Brown, we assume this will be one of your last appearances before the Congress as Chief of Staff of the Air Force. We congratulate you, and particularly on your assignment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We wish you every success in that, and we have every confidence that the position will be filled in a manner in which all Americans can be pleased and proud.

General **Brown**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. We will take the witnesses in order, followed by questioning by members of the subcommittee. First we will hear from the Honorable John L. McLucas, Secretary of the Air Force. You may proceed, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary **McLucas**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

While I, General Brown and General Clark are very pleased to be here with you today to discuss the admission of women to the service academies, specifically the Air Force Academy, we would like to give all three of our statements, if possible, before we go into the questions.

Mr. **Fisher**. Very well. We'll proceed that way.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN L. McLUCAS, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Secretary **McLucas**. I would just like to say a general word first. Namely, that we have only a few points that we would like to make today.

First of all, we believe in expanding opportunity for women in the military. We believe the evidence of the last few years would indicate that we are making progress in that direction. We have opened up for women the ROTC and OTS sources of commissions, and as an indication of the rapidly growing role of women in the Air Force, we have doubled the number of women in the Air Force since 1971, and are going to double it again by 1978.

So we believe that indicates our seriousness in opening up opportunities to women.

With respect to the Academy, we believe that the principal purpose of the Academy is to provide a nucleus of career-oriented combat leadership and to provide officers who are well rounded enough so that they can assume all the management roles which will be required of them throughout their Air Force careers.

Now women are excluded by law from the primary combat role in the Air Force, so you either must change the law or admit women to the Academy as noncombatants.

We don't believe that the American people are ready to change the law and allow women to engage in combat. We believe that if we admitted noncombatant people, women or otherwise, to the academies this would dilute the instruction program we have there, it would provide training to them which they could not use, at a great expense to the taxpayer.

My final point will be if we are ordered by the Congress to get on with it, we'll get on with it.

We believe the fundamental purpose of the Air Force Academy is to educate and train the future combat and combat-oriented leaders of the Air Force. We expect those leaders to come from today's cadets, each of whom should possess the will and potential as commissioned officers to lead the Air Force in performing its combat mission.

To meet this challenge, education and training of cadets necessarily entails demanding mental and physical preparation to develop the self-confidence, stamina, and self-discipline that has been characteristic of this Nation's successful combat leaders. We believe this carefully developed and demanding Academy training should continue to be reserved to train a nucleus of men who have the potential to fulfill the complete spectrum of Air Force leadership roles. The restrictions of law, policy, and practice that presently exclude women from combat suggest that providing Academy training to women would be a misuse of that resource inconsistent with the national will. We have understood from the very beginning of the Air Force Academy that the Congress intended that only men should be admitted.

As the committee is aware, about 75 percent of our Academy graduates go on to some type of flight training. Aircrew members are the officers most likely to engage in direct combat. Of course the balance of the graduates of the Air Force Academy have also received the full spectrum of military training and preparation for combat leadership. These officers may never fly or navigate aircraft in combat, but each is trained to provide leadership in other combat roles in which they are expected and have a duty to serve. We do not believe the American people favor exposing women either to direct engagement in combat or to other combat roles.

The Air Force officer force structure has historically—and deliberately—drawn strength from the practice of rotating officers among related career fields. For example, many of the officers who deal with the development of munitions have served as combat pilots and used munitions, and they may so serve again. Consequently, many of the officers serving in jobs that would not normally call for assignment to a combat role nonetheless stand ready to serve in combat support jobs. As a result of this policy, the number of Air Force officers who have not at some time served in one of these two categories is negligible. For example, during the Southeast Asia conflict officers from every Air

Force career field served in the combat zone, and all career fields were represented in Southeast Asia except strategic missile operations.

Public law and the policy of the Department of Defense discourage the exposure of women to combat. At the same time, our interest in equal opportunity, and our parallel interest in making the greatest possible use of the talents of people interested in serving the Air Force, have led to the employment of both officer and enlisted women throughout our force structure. In the Air Force, the only career fields from which women are excluded are those that would be directly involved in combat. Therefore, women officers—and enlisted personnel—just like their male counterparts—will in the course of normal careers have jobs which make them eligible for assignment into combat areas in which they are potentially exposed to hostile file. To prevent unreasonable exposure of women to the hazards of combat, including capture, personnel assignments for women are not based on career fields alone. Air Force policy, as in Southeast Asia, is to assign only men to active combat theaters until the conflict has stabilized and women can be assigned to specific jobs and locations in which the risk of injury due to hostile fire is relatively low.

The Air Force is committed fully to the concept of equal opportunity for its female members. They can and will continue to serve throughout our All Volunteer Force. Many opportunities exist through which women may obtain a college education and a commission in the Air Force. We are confident that these sources will continue to produce adequate numbers of female officers.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, we believe that education and training at the Air Force Academy should be reserved for those who will fulfill the Air Force combat and combat-oriented leadership roles. Should the American people indicate, through the Congress, their will to have women fill combat leadership positions in the Air Force, we in the Department of the Air Force will carry out that judgment and enter them in the Air Force Academy. Until such a change occurs, however, we believe the Nation's defense interests are best served by continuing to admit only males to the Air Force Academy.

Mr. Chairman, that completes my statement.

I would like to introduce General Brown.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Is it your desire that General Brown be heard next?

Secretary McLUCAS. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. Proceed, General Brown.

STATEMENT OF GEN. GEORGE S. BROWN, CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE AIR FORCE

General BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have a very brief statement.

I would like to first say that I agree completely with Secretary McLucas' statement, and I view the fundamental purpose of the Air Force Academy as providing a nucleus of professional career officers who can provide the required future leadership to the Air Force in executing its combat mission.

I might remind the committee that the mission of the Air Force is "to organize, train, and equip air forces for conduct of prompt and sustained combat operations in the air." I, too, believe that the best interests of the Nation and the Air Force are served by continuing to admit only males to the Air Force Academy.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Very well, thank you, General.

General Clark, we're particularly pleased to have you, because you're in a position to make a contribution, based upon actual experience you've had in the Academy at Colorado Springs, and we are delighted to have you here this morning. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. A. P. CLARK, SUPERINTENDENT, U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

General CLARK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

As a matter of record, I have been the superintendent since August 1, 1970.

I appreciate the opportunity to assist you in addressing an issue of great importance to the future defense of our country, and I would like to offer you my credentials before sharing with you my views on the admission of women to the Academy.

I was raised in the service atmosphere as my father was a medical officer in the U.S. Army. I graduated from West Point in 1936 and immediately entered into a flying career. During my subsequent 38 years of service I flew in combat in World War II and spent 33 months as a POW in Germany. I have commanded flying units in France, Saudi Arabia, and Okinawa, including several involved in combat in Southeast Asia.

I have served for 4 years as director of military personnel for the U.S. Air Force and 2 years as commander of the Air University, which controls the Air Force professional schools and the ROTC program. During this latter period I participated in the decision to open theAir Force ROTC program to women, and I fully supported this important policy decision.

I am the father of two grown daughters, one of whom is married to an Air Force flyer, and I have a son who is a captain in the Air Force and a flight instructor in jet fighters.

I would like to offer you my views on the issue at hand in three parts:

First, my views on the service of women in the Air Force in general. Second, my views on the appropriateness of opening up combat roles to women in military service. And third, my views on the wisdom of authorizing the appointment of females as cadets at the U.S. Air Force Academy.

First, let me assure you that I hold no reservation concerning the service of women in the U.S. Air Force. I fully support the actions being taken by the Air Force to increase the number of women, both in the enlisted and in the commissioned ranks. I further support fully the opening of all the career fields except those involving aircrew duties either as pilot or navigator and the launching of missiles.

In summary, I believe that there is no question that women can adopt and acquire the skills, through training, to do unlikely jobs very well.

Second, regarding the opening up of combat roles to women in service, I have strong reservations for the following reasons:

I believe that the physiological and biological differences between the sexes and the resulting evolutionary differences in their roles in society are ignored at our peril. I believe that the current surge of emphasis on equal opportunity for women is basically sound and has just and reasonable objectives, but that when carried to the extremes sometimes suggested, such as injecting women into the combat role in war, I believe we exceed the bounds of reason and logic.

Allow me to recount to you an interesting exchange I had with one of the most influential and respected groups of women in this country, the members of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services. This group, which includes distinguished women educators, successful career women, journalists, and the female general officers from all the uniformed services met at the Air Force Academy last year, and I sought an opportunity to obtain their views on this very issue: Is the bearing of arms in war an appropriate role for American women, and does the silent majority of our women seek approval for such a role? I was deliberately provocative and obtained a spirited response, the thrust of which was: "No, General, American women do not seek approval for this role, but we want you men to understand and to acknowledge that we can and would fight if our country were in desperate straits and we were needed to do so."

I acknowledge readily that the experience of our frontier women illustrates the willingness of women to share danger and hardship with their menfolk in time of crisis. The Russian use of women in combat late in World War II to defend their homeland was another, although unique, historical example of the use of women in a war crisis. One should note that this experiment was promptly discontinued when the emergency was ended.

Jacqueline Cochran recently expressed to me her keen disappointment when after World War II her highly qualified group of female pilots who constituted the WASP melted away to pursue more normal female objectives, such as marrying and raising a family. She had hoped they would stay and pursue a flying career for which they were well qualified.

I might point out here that our statistics show that our female officers reflect the same pattern today. They have left the service at a greater rate after completion of their service commitment. If this were to hold true for female Academy graduates, it would be a cost consideration of no small importance.

For this Nation to open combat roles to our women, short of a dire emergency, in my view, offends the dignity of womanhood and ignores the harsh realities of war.

Military history, the lessons of which again we ignore at our peril, my own personal experiences in combat, in prisoner of war camps, and in command of combat units convince me that fighting is a man's job and should remain so.

Those who press to inject women into combat roles grossly underestimate the physical, the mental, and the emotional stresses of combat in all its implications, including capture by the enemy. In my view, Sherman was right: "War is hell and you cannot refine it." To seek to do so to accommodate the pressures of social activism is to invite disaster in battle. Our potential enemies would rejoice to see us make the tragic error of exposing American women to capture in combat. I firmly believe that this situation would inevitably weaken our national resolve in war.

Let me now share with you my views regarding the impact of introducing female cadets at the U.S. Air Force Academy.

At the outset let me say that from the point of view of facility modification, curriculum change and organizational restructuring, given the necessary lead time and funding support, the Air Force Academy could comply with the national decision to admit women.

I oppose the proposition on much more fundamental grounds which I believe can best be summarized as follows:

The main line of the Air Force mission is flying and fighting. Everything else the Air Force does revolves around this basic function. Our recent experience in combat in Southeast Asia made clear that the changing nature of warfare can deeply involve personnel in many career fields in the bearing of arms and exposure to fire. Combat support personnel cannot count on secure billets far behind a well-defined front line. Many an engineer, mechanic and intelligence officer found himself fighting for his life in Southeast Asia. In addition there were a number of such officers in the POW camps in Germany and Japan in World War II. Indeed, on Bataan the aviation forces ended up in the foxholes with the infantry—all of them, including the finance officers and the personnel officers.

What this means to me is that our future Air Force leaders trained and educated at the Air Force Academy, including that small percentage not graduating into flying roles, must continue to be given full combat training.

Each year at least 70 percent of each graduating class enter flying careers. Among the remainder some enter duties associated with missiles another hazardous duty still reserved to male officers. Most of the remaining graduates, some 20 percent, enter other career fields in which woman may also be assigned but from which only the male officers may be sent on a moment's notice into an active combat zone.

An often misunderstood factor in military officer assignments is the changing nature of these assignments. The fact that at some time in his early career an officer is assigned to duties unrelated to combat in no way precludes his subsequent assignment to a combat zone either in the same or a different skill. As an example, I have spent 9 of my 38 years of commissioned service in personnel, 2 years at schools, and most of the balance in operational staff, active flying and command. As a further example, in the recently graduated Air Force Academy Class of 1974, out of a class of 800, the vast majority received initial assignments into combat duties or duties in direct support of our combat force. Those who did not go directly to such duties can and probably will be assigned into combat fields sometime during their careers—all are properly trained and prepared to perform in combat.

Let me say a word about this training which prepares our Academy graduates for combat roles.

If there is any one constant in our changing world it is the physical, the mental, and the emotional demands of battle. We are sometimes accused at the Air Force Academy of being too demanding in our training; some accuse us of employing "Mickey Mouse" training techniques and of harrassment of cadets. Yet, in spite of a growing permissiveness in our society and an ever increasing emphasis on the so-called good life of material pleasures and creature comforts, the hazards and demands of combat do not get easier. The winner in battle is he who has the superior skill, weapons, courage, and tenacity. It was always so and it will always be so.

Further, to lead men to success in battle requires the ability to make quick and correct decisions under stress, the willingness to accept responsibility for the lives and safety of others when they are exhausted and disheartened, and the willingness to risk danger and hardship with a degree of self-discipline well above the cut of the average man.

The environment at the Air Force Academy is designed around these stark realities. The cadet's day is filled with constant pressure. His life is filled with competition, combative and contact sports, rugged field training, use of weapons, flying and parachuting, strict discipline and demands to perform to the limit of endurance mentally, physically and emotionally.

It is this type of training that brings victory in battle.

It is my considered judgment that the introduction of female cadets will inevitably erode this vital atmosphere. This will be true regardless of whether females are to be entered into combat roles or not. It will be more evident if the Academy is required to establish a modified program to accommodate females in other than a combat role.

What I am saying is that the Academy will inevitably find it necessary to create a modified program to accommodate the female cadet or, God forbid, be required to water down the entire program to accommodate female cadets, ostensibly to prepare them for a combat role.

To impair the fighting edge of the Air Force's future combat leadership in the face of the implacable, well-trained, ruthless, all-male military forces which characterize our most likely future enemies, in my judgment, would not look well in the history books. I urge that we not experiment in this direction with the future defense of the Nation.

That's the end of my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you, General Clark, for a very comprehensive discussion of this subject, from one who is certainly in a position to discuss it with considerable authority and knowledge.

This committee, as you know, has the responsibility for making a determination when we conclude the hearings as to whether women should be admitted to the Academies, and, if so, whether we should proceed with any action to repeal existing laws which would prevent them from engaging in combat duties.

I'm one of these who feel that—and I think a good number of the members do—that if women are going to the Academies they should be prepared and willing to be assigned to combat roles. If they are not agreeable to that, then they should not be admitted to the Academies.

We heard testimony from the Navy the other day, in which they dwelt at some length on the difference between restricted duties and nonrestricted duties, meaning restricted to combat roles and those not restricted.

The argument had been advanced here rather forcefully that there are plenty of assignments that women could fill which are not related to combat, even as many of the male graduates of the Academies are now assigned to noncombat functions, and therefore there could be found a proper place for them in proper roles without regard to the combat aspect of it.

What would be your comment on that?

General **Clark**. Mr. Chairman, I certainly recognize, and the Air Force's personnel policies recognize, the fact that there are many appropriate duty assignments throughout the structure of the Air Force, with the reservation of three, only three, for women. Our personnel policies are fully capable of protecting women from exposure to the hazards of combat, even though they serve effectively in these assignments.

The thrust of my reservations with regard to opening the Academy to female cadets rests on the fact that all of the graduates of the Academy are fully trained for combat service, which is a flexibility that the Air Force needs to protect at great cost. We all know that at any one given time only a small fraction of our people are actually involved in combat, even in war, but you have to recognize losses and rotations, which means you have to protect a rotation base of fully-qualified and ready people to enter combat on short notice. Therefore, those who graduate from the Air Force Academy, I feel, should remain fully combat prepared and trained, and with the attitudes and motivation and the will to win, the spirit of teamwork, and the aggressive attitudes that are absolutely vital in combat. This requires a certain atmosphere to be protected at the Academy, which I would hate to see eroded, and I feel personally that it would inevitably be so eroded if we were to open the Academy up to those who are not going to assume this combat readiness posture.

Mr. **Fisher**. Following up on that observation, would it be your view that if they are going to be admitted that we consider repealing the law that now prohibits women from engaging in combat in the use of aircraft?

General **Clark**. While I personally don't feel that our women should be invited into the combat role, for the reasons which I have stated previously, I feel it's the lesser of two evils to go that route rather than to invite the Academies to have a mix, some of whom are not going to get the full advantage of the training.

If the Academy should be required to accept female cadets in a "not for combat" status, when and if the Equal Rights Amendment passes, we will have a condition of sex discrimination favoring females (i.e., easier programs). This condition could produce suits from male candidates who recognize discrimination in the physical aptitude examination for example, and from male cadets because of the easier program. But by then, we would be irrevocably committed and the net result would probably be the dilution of the entire program.

Mr. **Fisher**. In other words, it is your view that if we are going to undertake as a national policy to admit women to the Air Force

Academy and to the other Academies, they should be admitted only if they may be subjected to combat roles? Is that correct?

General CLARK. That would be my view; yes, sir.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, may I say that I have great respect and admiration for each of the three gentlemen who are with us this morning: Secretary McLucas, whom I have been with in California on several occasions; General Brown; and General Clark, whom I've had the privilege of visiting with at the Academy on several occasions.

I feel that the Air Force is in great hands with you gentlemen in the respective functions that you have for the Air Force and the Academy itself.

I disagree with you, however, on the conclusions you have come to insofar as allowing women into the Air Force Academy, or any of the Academies.

When Admiral Mack was here last week, in connection with the presentation of the Navy, he indicated that he had no fears that there were a sufficient number of qualified women in the country who could do just as well as men at the Academy under the present curriculum; that all men are not qualified to perform at the Naval Academy in the same manner as those who are selected.

Would you agree that this could be true with the Air Force Academy also, General Clark?

General CLARK. I certainly agree with Admiral Mack that the average man would have great difficulty in successfully completing our 4-year program.

I think there would be a few women who probably could do it. I'm not sure that they would be the typical normal, healthy American young women whom we are looking for, for commission in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. There seems to be a hangup on this business of "You can't do it because the law doesn't allow you and because the Academy is strictly for the training of combat officers."

Congress is in the business of changing laws, and making laws, all of the time, and I don't see that this is a particular problem. As a matter of fact, I'm having a bill drafted now to repeal the sections that prohibit women from going to combat, just so that we won't have this excuse thrown at us any more. I don't know whether I'll have any luck with the bill or not. It probably will be considered when we consider the bill that is now before us, as an amendment, or as an additional piece of legislation.

I don't understand why you have no objection to women taking the Air Force ROTC training—yet where they are going to be trained for the same thing, you find difficulty in feeling that they should be able to go to the Academy.

General CLARK. As you know, Mr. Wilson, there's a great deal of difference between the product of ROTC and the product of the Air Force Academy. I don't mean to imply that a capable person from either program would not be successful ultimately, but it takes some years for an ROTC graduate, who is a probationary Reserve officer with only a smattering of professional training, to achieve the point of effectiveness that our graduates have upon graduation as Regular officers due to their superb training for the job.

So I think you have to look down the pike some years before you can make a valid comparison, either in costs or in effectiveness, of the graduates from the two sources.

Furthermore, our ROTC and OTS graduates, unfortunately, leave the service at a considerably higher rate than do our Academy graduates. And our females leave the service at a somewhat greater rate than do our males, overall.

So there is considerable difference, in my mind, between the graduates from the different sources.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Would one of the reasons be that the opportunities for advancement are not as great as they would be if they could go to the Academy?

General CLARK. No, sir. These statistics I have examined. It would be fair to admit there has been a considerable change in the past 10 years in the opportunities for women in the services, but at this time they are progressing at an equal rate, and they have equal opportunity with our male officers in competition for promotion and things of this sort.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. You mention that 75 percent of the graduates of the Academy go on to flight training and eventually become pilots. Do you still have that medical program where a certain number of each class has the opportunity to go to medical school? It's a small number, I realize that.

General CLARK. Yes; there is a small number, but we are phasing out of this program upon the directions of the Congress, and the only commitments that remain are those that have to be honored because it has been announced in our catalog, and these are the commitments made to those who are currently enrolled as cadets. No cadets who enter from this summer on will have that opportunity, and we'll be out of that program by 1977.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. How many years do you figure that an individual should remain in the Air Force in order for you to not have wasted the money that has been spent on their training at the Academy?

General CLARK. At least 20 years, sir.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Twenty years?

General CLARK. Hopefully, 30.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. And what percentage of graduates do stay in? Of course, you haven't had experience with the Air Force Academy yet, but we do with the others. Most of the senior Air Force officers went to West Point. But what percentage do stay in 20 years or longer, do you know?

General CLARK. Our oldest class now has 15 years of service, and we have 65 percent of the graduates of that class still on active duty.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. You have 65 percent?

General CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Do you have figures, General, or any of you gentlemen, of what percentage of officers who are considered combat prepared have come from the Academy and what percentage have come from the ROTC programs or officer training programs?

General BROWN. Mr. Wilson, I've seen a number that's expressed as the percent of aircrew members who flew in combat in Southeast Asia, who were graduates of the Air Force Academy, and as I remember, it was something like 9 percent.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Ninety percent?

General BROWN. Nine percent.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Was it 9 or 90?

General BROWN. Nine percent of the aircrew members who flew in combat in Southeast Asia were graduates of the Air Force Academy

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Those serving in Southeast Asia; they would be almost all graduates from the Air Force Academy, wouldn't they? You wouldn't have too many from West Point or the Naval Academy that would be included in the Air Force in that case?

General BROWN. I'm sure it would swell the number slightly, but in the overall total, it would be very small.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. The Academy really doesn't furnish a significant percentage of those who were in combat?

General BROWN. No. But, Mr. Wilson, I think this goes in part to your earlier question, which General Clark responded to, on the women. On the other hand, I thought you were aiming at the difference between the Academy graduate and the ROTC graduate, or those who were commissioned from the officer training school program.

I think that statistics will show rather clearly that the leadership that General Clark stressed so much, the combat leadership, was carried out by the people who were Academy graduates, that is, West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy, who were on active duty in the Air Force in the war. Of this number, they held leadership positions, command positions, in a far higher ratio than their ROTC counterparts.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. I see. Of course, a lot of that could be because you give the Academy graduates greater opportunities; don't you?

General BROWN. No; I don't believe that's so, sir. I don't know—and I've told ROTC cadets this, and it's a fact—I don't know where a man comes from. But when you see the performance, you then pick the fellow who's performing the best and move him in to command a squadron, or a wing, or whatnot, and of the few Academy graduates who were in the war in the 2 years I was there, far more of them held responsible command positions than the percentage of ROTC graduates.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. I would think that this would be accurate, because there's no question that the real tough training and the solid training that they get at the Academy does give them an advantage over those who are in the regular college program, even though it's a good ROTC program that they are receiving.

General BROWN. I want to say, as I don't want to leave a misimpression, that there obviously have been exceptional leaders who have come from other than West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy. General Lemay was not an Academy product; Ohio University, I believe, or Ohio State. The man designated to succeed me as Chief of Staff of the Air Force was not an Academy graduate. General Jones comes from North Dakota. Exceptional men.

So there are these people, but there aren't as many of them, regrettably, percentagewise.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. Mr. Chairman, I may have another question later on, but I'll yield right now.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Hillis.

Mr. **Hillis**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, appreciate each of your statements, and I have just a very few questions.

When the Army was before us on this subject, a question came up of other service schools in which women were admitted; service schools such as the Army War College, Staff and Command School training programs, and we were told that women were sometimes taken into these programs, in other words, they were not closed.

What other training schools in the Air Force may be comparable to these, and are women admitted?

General **Brown**. Yes. Women are admitted to all comparable schools in the Air Force.

Mr. **Hillis**. In all but the Academy?

General **Brown**. All but the Academy and flight training, and in paramedics, I don't believe we have exposed any to that field. But the professional military educational schools, the War College, Command and Staff, Squadron Officers School course are all open to women.

Mr. **Hillis**. In the future do you foresee more women officers in the Air Force, and more women officers being elevated into more responsible leadership roles, even if they be noncombat roles?

General **Brown**. Yes, sir, we do. As the Secretary commented on, we have quite a program of expansion for women in the Air Force, both commissioned and noncommissioned, and they will compete with men for these responsible positions. We have some women commanding mixed units today.

Mr. **Hillis**. How many general officers does the Air Force have at the present who are women?

General **Brown**. At this time we have two. We have a nurse and a personnel officer.

Mr. **Hillis**. I would like to address a couple of questions to General Clark, if I might.

First of all, I would like to know the cost of the program of educating a cadet at the Academy presently.

General **Clark**. We fixed a figure at about $79,000 this year, Mr. Hillis. This is a figure which, unfortunately, has risen in terms of inflation and pay raises which the cadets enjoy, as well as all other military personnel. If you were to take this cost in terms of constant dollars since 1967, it's been reduced over that period of time. Unfortunately, the inflation and the pay raises have made the difference. But we fix it at $79,000 at this time.

Mr. **Hillis**. Can you give the committee the comparable figure for the cost of an ROTC scholarship program in which women might serve?

General **Clark**. The scholarship graduate is listed at $13,200; the nonscholarship graduate at $8,500.

Mr. **Hillis**. Thank you.

Actually, the amount of combat training that's given on the Academy itself, on the grounds of the Academy, is rather small, is it not, the actual combat role training?

General CLARK. I would not say so, Mr. Hillis. Twenty-two percent of our formal offerings in the academic curriculum are oriented to combat instruction, but a vast majority of the other instruction that occurs at the Academy, well over 50 percent of it, is combat oriented.

Mr. HILLIS. I think Mr. Wilson hit on this area, and I don't want to pursue it too much further, but apparently quite a percentage of the professional officers corps, in other words, the professional leadership of the Air Force, does come from the Academy.

Would admitting women cut down the number of male billets for enrollment? How many people do you have there, and how much capacity? Are you in 100 percent capacity now?

General CLARK. We will be this summer with the entry of the new class. We operate under the same authorized ceiling as the others, as all three service academies, which is 4,417, and we will slightly exceed this, as a matter of fact, initially, with our summer attrition bringing us down to the point where we will be able to accommodate the strength of the wing by the time the school starts in the fall. We will begin academics with a strength of about 4,300.

Mr. HILLIS. You made mention in your statement, General, about some of our experiences in past wars, such as Bataan and other areas.

Are there any women serving with the Air Force in Europe now?

General CLARK. I'm sure there are.

General BROWN. Yes; a great number.

Mr. HILLIS. So it's conceivable that if a land war were to break out there on the conventional basis that they might become involved even though they would be perhaps initially at a rear echelon station?

General BROWN. It's conceivable, but we don't look on that as a position of exposure. We also have dependents there. We have civilian schoolteachers for the children.

Mr. HILLIS. I see.

I'm sure you classify service in a missile area as combat service, do you not, even though the people may be based in this Nation 5,000 miles away from it—the hostile forces?

General BROWN. Yes. The crews in the Minutemen and in the Titan missile sites in the United States are considered combat crews, and that duty is restricted to males today.

Mr. HILLIS. Could not women perform that duty?

General BROWN. I think it's conceivable, yes, sir.

Mr. HILLIS. The point I'm getting at, in your opinion, could Congress determine as policy that women could serve in certain type of combat roles but not in others?

General BROWN. I'm sure that's possible. I would hope that if it's done, it is done in such a manner that it doesn't restrict our flexibility.

What I have in mind is that certain types of aircrews are combat support, quite obviously; while the SAM flight that flies Government people on business trips—they are not exposed to combat. But then we would be restricted in the flexibility we enjoy. Most of those aircrews have flown in combat. We pulled them out if we needed them in South Vietnam; we converted them to the type of equipment out there, and we brought them back. We had 105 pilots who flew transports in SAM, and then went back. Everybody took their turn as a general rule, and if we run into this sort of thing, with the inflexibility of certain people that we can't use in combat, we'd pay a price.

Mr. **Hillis**. One last question, and perhaps I'll address it to the Secretary.

Would you care to comment for the record, what would have been, would you say, the political effects in our country if there had been some women as prisoners in North Vietnam, American servicewomen?

Secretary **McLucas**. Mr. Hillis, that's a difficult question to answer. I think that there was considerable concern about our prisoners of war as people, as men in this case. I think the concern would have been heightened, I believe, politically, if there had been women also included, but I really don't know any way to quantify that.

Mr. **Hillis**. Thank you.

That's all the questions I have now, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. OK. Mr. Daniel.

Mr. **Dan Daniel**. Dr. McLucas, has a cost-effective study been made with respect to admitting women to the Academy?

Secretary **McLucas**. Yes, in the sense of how much it would cost to modify the facilities to accommodate women. There are two cases you might consider. One is that you keep the capacity the same as it is now, and make whatever facility changes are necessary just because there are women there. Those costs are relatively slight, about $23,000 for the first year assuming admission of 120–150 females.

Another approach, of course, would be to increase the capacity of the school and add women in addition to the current cadet load. If you did that, the cost, presumably, would go up percentagewise.

The budget is about $80 million a year. The $80 million would go up depending on how many you added. Then you'd have to build facilities to accommodate.

I think, if your question is addressed at the cost to us of reducing the output in terms of the number of officers——

Mr. **Dan Daniel**. That's the substance, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary **McLucas**. Yes. Well, it seems to me every officer you lost, then you've spent $79,000, or whatever that number is, and got a noncombat officer in exchange for that trade. We think that's not a good trade.

Mr. **Dan Daniel**. Somehow that difference would have to be made up in order to meet your requirements, would it not?

Secretary **McLucas**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Dan Daniel**. General Brown, would you differentiate between the academies with respect to the admission of women? Is there any difference, so far as you are concerned, as the Air Force as opposed to the Army, or the Army as opposed to the Navy?

General **Brown**. I think that fundamentally they're the same. I could not differentiate. I think basically all academies train combat leaders. I think all services have spaces for commissioned female officers.

I think each service would feel that it's not in the best interests of the Armed Forces or the country to train women at the service academies. We would, I believe, all prefer, although I haven't consulted with my counterparts, to train female personnel for commissions through other means, ROTC or officer training school programs, as we do today.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. General Clark, how do you define a combat role?

General CLARK. Mr. Daniel, we define combat as those who engage the enemy, those who launch or handle weapons in the face of the enemy, and those who are exposed to the direct force of enemy action. That constitutes combat, as we see it.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. How is the mission statement of the Air Force Academy worded? Does it include "combat" wording?

General CLARK. It doesn't include the word "combat," sir. It, in effect, says that our mission is to provide the instruction and the experience to every cadet so that he will graduate with the knowledge and the character to serve effectively as a Regular officer in the Air Force and have the motivation to serve his country for a career.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. You touched on this in response to some other questions and also in your statement, and you might want to provide this for the record if you prefer to do so, specifically what combat training is required of all cadets at the Academy?

General CLARK. We give them, of course, in every way a feeling of the importance of teamwork. We instill in them the desire to win. We, through the use of combat-support programs, teach them the ability to endure hardship and to perform to the utmost of their physical ability. We try to instill courage so that they will be more responsive to the strains and stresses of combat, and we do this throughout their entire way of life. They handle weapons. We have all types of specific combat training, including that which is acquired through temporary duty with the Navy, such as underwater demolitions training. They go to Fort Benning and take parachute training. They have airmanship training at the Academy. We take them up in the hills and subject them to survival situations. We put them in situations where they will have to use their resourcefulness under adversity. We subject them to stress training throughout the entire 4 years so that they will get used to stress and the ability to make quick and proper decisions under stress circumstances. All of this you might call an environment that we have deliberately created at the Academy to instill in them all of those characteristics which history tells us are essential in a fighting leader, and, while this is hard to quantify in terms of items in the curriculum, it represents a very high percentage of the total training atmosphere at the Academy.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. What percent of combat officers training is accomplished at the service academy?

General CLARK. All except some of the summer programs, which involve sending them out to other places, such as the Army for parachute training, the Navy for demolitions training, and things of this sort.

So the vast majority of it is performed at the Academy.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Ninety percent, would you say, or 80 percent?

General CLARK. I would say 90 percent would be a good estimate of it.

We have many organic programs at the Academy, probably a higher percentage of organic programs than the other service academies, right there at the institution, so it's a very high percentage at the Academy.

Mr. **Dan Daniel**. Dr. McLucas, in response to an earlier question, going back to that just a moment, if the Congress decides to admit women to the Academy, and we do not pass the bill which was referred to a moment ago by my friend, Mr. Wilson, and you have 1,000 women apply and accepted at the Air Force Academy, will that mean that you will have to expand the facilities by that number in order to meet your requirements, if the requirements were the same, of course?

Secretary **McLucas**. If I may make sure I understood the question? If 1,000 women would be accepted?

Mr. **Dan Daniel**. Yes, sir. Noncombat.

Secretary **McLucas**. I don't see how we could accommodate 1,000 women.

Mr. **Dan Daniel**. Well, you'd expand your facilities, would you not, if that was your program?

Secretary **McLucas**. Let me say if there was some sort of a tie-in arrangement wherein we were asked to admit 1,000 women and expand the facility concomitantly to accommodate them, obviously we can do that. I didn't understand that was the thrust of your question. But yes, we would have to expand the facility markedly, or else we would have to get used to the Academy producing mainly women.

Mr. **Dan Daniel**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General **Brown**. May I add to that?

Mr. **Dan Daniel**. Yes, General Brown.

General **Brown**. I have never seen, nor could I now substantiate, a specific number of potential combat leaders, or combat leaders, produced by the Air Force Academy. However, intuitively I would have to say that if we lost a third of them, or a fourth of them, say, a fourth of that production, it would be a very, very disastrous thing for the Air Force.

What we get from the Air Force Academy is obviously a small percent of the total, but as General Clark pointed out, and I certainly substantiate, they have training, and a conditioning, and an approach to life that is unique from the new product from the ROTC program. Now, 15 years, or 20 years, after they get out, you probably can't tell the difference, if they're still in the Active Force. But for a great number of years there is a very, very noticeable difference in most individuals.

Mr. **Fisher**. Very well.

Mrs. Holt, if you will bear with me for one question at this point?

Mrs. **Holt**. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. Following up on Mr. Daniel's question about what would happen if 1,000 women should be admitted—a hypothetical situation, which conceivably could happen because, after all, you will have no control over who is admitted, if they qualify, if the law is changed. That's correct, isn't it?

General **Clark**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Fisher**. Very well. If 1,000 women are admitted, would that mean that there are 1,000 fewer men admitted? Is that right?

General **Clark**. That is correct, sir.

Mr. FISHER. All right.

Mrs. Holt.

Mrs. HOLT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, gentlemen. It's very interesting to hear your views.

Mr. Secretary, I certainly appreciate your revising your statement to admit women, instead of just addressing us as "gentlemen." Thank you.

I also want to apologize to General Clark if I've misquoted him. I'm afraid I misunderstood you when I visited and heard your statement about your position.

But I agree with you, General Clark, that ignoring the evolutionary differences, not the traditional roles of women, but the biological roles, is very dangerous, that the family structure is so important to me, and I think that we ought to always keep that uppermost in our minds, even though we change the roles of the family, that we are still the childbearers, and I think that that's a privilege that we shouldn't let go by very easily.

But I would like to hear your comments on the possibility of a dual system. You mentioned it. But when Mr. Daniel asked you about the definition of "combat," but today combat has changed just in recent times, and shouldn't we redefine "combat," think about it from that angle? There are women who aspire to be leaders, to be officers in the Air Force, and shouldn't they have the opportunity for the same high quality leadership training?

Why couldn't we have a dual track system in the academies and give them this education and at the same time redefine what combat is?

In the Israeli forces, they do this. They certainly have a dual system there. They don't use women in combat, but they train them, and they keep them in the Reserve until age 30, I believe, but that's different from the way they treat their men.

I would like to hear your comments on that.

General CLARK. Mrs. Holt, first of all, let me say that I would hope that the United States, certainly not in our time, never has its back to the wall to the same degree that the Israelis do.

Mrs. HOLT. I agree with you there.

General CLARK. I rather imagine that would partly influence their policies with regard to how close to actual combat their women would be permitted to serve.

Mrs. HOLT. But we are giving women equal opportunities in our military today.

General CLARK. Yes, indeed, and, of course, we all believe in this. The thing that concerns me the most, I guess, is the effort to redefine "combat." I don't think combat is going to change. It hasn't changed for thousands of years, and the stresses that are involved in combat, that make the demands on an individual, especially in a leadership position, are almost beyond description unless you've experienced it, and I don't think we should inject our women into that role if we don't have to. It's a semantic exercise, of course, to redefine "combat," but I don't think it would change the harsh realities of it, and I would urge that we not approach this problem in that direction because I don't think it will really change the facts of life on combat.

Mrs. Holt. Thank you.

That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. Charles Wilson. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Wilson has one or two other questions.

Mr. Charles Wilson. Dr. McLucas, as you probably know, there are some Members of Congress who would like to abolish the academies. They feel that the cost of $79,000, for example, to educate a cadet at one of the academies as against a much lesser cost in the ROTC program does not justify keeping the academies open. It's not a big movement at the present time, but I can see that attitude growing, particularly if we keep fighting this thing about allowing women in the academies. You cannot, in my opinion, give such a specialized education to one sex in this country and not have it available to the other.

What did you say it was, $79,000 for the Air Force Academy and $13,000 for the ROTC program?

Secretary McLucas. Yes, sir.

Mr. Charles Wilson. Of course, you don't pay the tuition like the Naval ROTC does, do you?

General Clark. I'd like to comment on that, if I may, sir.

Secretary McLucas. Yes.

General Clark. Mr. Wilson, the precommissioning costs are really just the tip of the iceberg when we compare the cost of producing a career officer from these two sources. If you, for example, run this out to just the 20-year point alone, you will find that the costs of the Air Force Academy graduate are quite comparable to those of the ROTC graduate, and this is largely because of the high rate of loss during that 20-year period of those who come out of the ROTC program. We often invest a great deal of money and effort in postgraduate training and education in our officers. For example, to produce an aircraft commander on one of our big combat aircraft from a graduate of either of these sources may cost a half a million dollars. If at the end of that time he stays for a career, at a much higher rate than those from the other source, you can amortize the Air Force Academy practically.

Our graduate rate of loss is 28 percent, as compared to something like a 57-percent loss rate for ROTC, and that's a very considerable item. So that the precommissioning costs are just one small fraction of the overall package, and I think when you look at it from the long-range point of view it's much more significant, especially if the rate of loss of female officers is even greater than that of the male officers, and our experience today has been that that's the case.

Mr. Charles Wilson. It's pretty hard. You really haven't had enough experience to get a good figure on that.

General Clark. That's true.

Mr. Charles Wilson. But you're just now beginning to get significant numbers.

General Clark. That's true. The samples are relatively small in the female officers of the force and we don't have any female officer graduates from the Academy, but I have no reason to believe that the pattern would not continue.

Mr. Charles Wilson. Mr. Daniel suggested a very hypothetical case of 1,000 potential entrants in 1 year to the Academy. We know that's impossible, because you do have control over the persons who are admitted to the Academy.

I would assume that if a young lady applied to the Academy she'd be subject to the same regulations as was any male applicant, that you have a three-way test: they have to be academically fit; they have to be physically fit; and they have to have a broad base of extracurricular activities.

General **Clark**. That's right.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. And I would think that your computers, and the things that you use to learn or to determine which male is best fit would also determine whether a young lady is fit physically to take the combat training that would be available at the Academy.

I just don't visualize these large figures as any threat, or anything that would present problems to you. You don't really think that this problem presents itself—an unusually unbalanced number of women applicants, do you?

Secretary **McLucas**. I think we can all comment on that.

I think, first of all, we don't know how many women would apply.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. I think we're probably overestimating. The first year you might get a lot of applicants, but I think it would level off.

Secretary **McLucas**. My guess is no better than anybody else's, but my guess is we would get a relatively small number of people who applied and who actually qualified. We would actually like to screen women the same way we do men.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. You should.

Secretary **McLucas**. We'd have to have a large number of nominees, as compared to the number we actually expected to admit. If you wanted to admit 1,000, that means you're going to have to screen 6,000 or 8,000, and I, frankly, don't think there are that many women who want to get into the Air Force Academy.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. You have 8 to 10 applicants with the young men and you take over 1,000, don't you? How many go in each year, about 1,500?

Secretary **McLucas**. Yes; that's right, about 1,500. So my guess is that we would not be overwhelmed with these thousands of applications.

General Clark, or General Brown, would you care to address this?

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. One other thing that's come up is that you don't think women would be able to face up to the ordeal of POW experience.

I don't know whether this is true or not. Did we have some nurse POW's in World War II in the Philippines?

Secretary **McLucas**. Nurses, yes.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. How did they come out? Did they conduct themselves all right?

Secretary **McLucas**. They came out well. But we think there is a basic distinction there; namely, that people who sign up in the medical service are recognized as such, and these nurses ended up doing duty as nurses, and they weren't women who had been out firing guns at people. We think if they had been that they might have been treated differently.

Mr. **Charles Wilson.** I don't know. I think there again I would imagine—and this is just my own opinion—that women are just as courageous and just as brave, and many times they show much more courage than men.

Secretary **McLucas.** That's our opinion too. We agree with you 100 percent on that. We don't question that.

Mr. **Charles Wilson.** You had Micki King at the Academy. Are there any doubts in your mind that she would have had any difficulty in taking the training?

Secretary **McLucas.** I don't think it's a question of whether they can withstand it, Mr. Wilson. I think women are just as courageous, and so on, as men. It's a question of whether the American people want their women subjected to this. That's really the question in our mind.

Mr. **Charles Wilson.** Mr. Chairman, that's all I have right now. Thank you.

Mr. **Fisher.** Let me ask one or two questions.

Getting back to the 1,000 hypothetical figure that Mr. Daniel mentioned, I would think it would not be unreasonable to assume that if we enact a law to admit women to the Air Force Academy that eventually at a given time out of the 4,400, 1,000 of them might be women. Isn't that a reasonable assumption that that would happen over the course of time?

General **Clark.** I should think so.

Mr. **Fisher.** I don't think that's an unreasonable assumption at all.

General **Clark.** The administrative obstacles and the procedures are not really what distress us. You can always solve these things.

Mr. **Fisher.** Yes; I'm sure.

General **Clark.** If it were important to obtain 25 percent of each entry class from females, we may have to launch a very aggressive recruiting program, but if that was the will of the Congress we would do it.

Mr. **Fisher.** Very well.

With regard to the concern that you express, all of you, I think, about the desire of the American people to have military women committed to combat or to be available for that purpose—I have reservations about that myself. I think a good many people do. It's going to take a lot of soul searching before we go so far as to remove any restrictions in that respect. Certainly we'll be giving that very careful consideration before we move in that direction.

Therefore, assuming for the moment that that isn't done, let's talk about where we would be and how much justification is there for spending $79,000 a year on training a student at the Air Force Academy for a noncombat role.

Is that cost-effective? Can we afford that kind of expenditure for a noncombat service role or not? What's your comment about that, Mr. Secretary, and the others?

Secretary **McLucas.** We think the answer to that is, no; just because there are other sources at less cost to provide what we think is adequate training for the noncombat jobs that the women are going to take up. It seems to me the principal difference between what you get in this $13,000 ROTC scholarship—and, by the way, I think we should open up more of those to women, and we're doing it—but the main difference between what you get for that and the $79,000 product is this combat-oriented training, and why should we buy it if we are not going to use it? It seems to me it would be frustrating for people to be trained for combat and not be involved in it.

Perhaps General Brown may want to add to that.

General **Brown**. I think, of course, in the record are the assignments of past graduates of the academies, and there is a percentage who have gone to the Academy who were not physically fit to fly, which is the primary combat function in the Air Force. Usually it's eye difficulty. But nevertheless, they do take this combat training, and we are training leadership for support functions closely alined with combat, or could be, and the potential is there.

I agree with the Secretary, and the point we made earlier, that I can't get away from this loss figure that we experience in other sources of training than the Air Force Academy. While it's still not as high as we'd like, and we're working hard at it, it's still a lot better than we experience in other places, and I think we can only translate that experience to what might happen with women graduates of the Academy, but, true, we don't know.

Mr. **Fisher**. This question has been raised by other witnesses previously.

Do you know if there is any nation in the world today that permits women to be drafted, or committed, to military service for combat purposes?

Secretary **McLucas**. I don't know of any.

General **Clark**. I'm not aware of any, sir.

Mr. **Fisher**. Therefore, if the Congress should decide to do this, that is, to repeal the laws that now prohibit women in combat, if that should all be wiped out and women should in the future be treated for combat purposes the same as men who are recruited into the military service, we would probably be the only nation in the world that would be doing that.

Is that a fair statement?

Secretary **McLucas**. As far as I know.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. **Fisher**. Yes.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. To act to repeal the law dosen't necessarily mean they go into combat, Mr. Chairman. I would imagine that all these other countries don't have a similar law. They probably have no law at all. Just the fact that they don't have a law doesn't mean they go into combat.

Mr. **Fisher**. I'm talking about the service academies now. I'm talking about the fact that if we repeal the laws, those who go to these service academies are going to be assigned to, or be subject to assignment, to combat roles. That is the very point I was making in illustrating the uniqueness that would be involved.

Are you aware of any country in the world today that has service academies which admit women to be trained for combat roles?

General **Clark**. I'm not aware of any, sir.

General **Brown**. I know of none.

Mr. **Fisher**. Any other questions, Mr. Hillis?

Mr. **Hillis**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Brown, you referred to this group that go to the Academy who will be in a nonflying status, usually because of eye deficiencies.

Isn't it a fact that they are approximately 25 percent of the incoming class?

General **Brown**. Twenty to twenty-five percent; yes, sir.

Mr. **Hillis**. And they are accepted basically in what would be more or less a noncombat capacity; is that not true?

General **Brown**. We know they are not going to fly. that's true, and that is the majority of the combat. On the other hand, they do take the combat training that General Clark described and they are potential combat leaders.

I'll give you a specific example of the type of situation where we would use those people. In Vietnam we had some women. We selected with great care the 2 years I was there where we would assign those women. There were some areas where we didn't put women because we didn't want to expose them to ground fire. Danang was a base where we didn't use women.

On the other hand, we had the same functions going on in Danang that we had at every other base. So the fellow who ran the communications squadron; the fellow who ran the electronics shop, administered the troops in their housing and feeding, and this sort of thing, were all male officers. Whereas some of those functions could very well have been done, and are done today, at other bases by women.

Mr. **Hillis**. General Clark, if rather than 1,000 women entering the Academy there would be about 100, could the administration of the Academy be structured so that a program of this kind could be instituted and run along with the regular program and yet not lower the admission standards?

General **Clark**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Hillis**. Could you get geared up to do this?

General **Clark**. There's no administrative obstacle that we couldn't cope with.

Mr. **Hillis**. If it were a realistic number, where you weren't replacing, say, 1,000 potential cadets?

General **Clark**. If you're talking about a level total of only 100 female cadets, I would say that isn't cost-effective, and it would be so small a sample in a 4,400-man strength cadet wing that I wouldn't recommend that, but it's feasible, and we could do it.

Mr. **Hillis**. What would be a cost-effective figure?

General **Clark**. If we had to do it, I would certainly recommend that we take in something like 120 to 150 a year and build a strength of 400 to 600, which represents about half of that percent that are not destined to fly.

Mr. **Hillis**. That would be approximately 10 to 12 percent then, is that correct?

General **Clark**. Yes; that is right.

Mr. **Hillis**. That's all the questions I have.

Mr. **Fisher**. That's a very good question that you asked. I'm glad you did, Mr. Hillis.

Mr. Hogan has some questions.

Mr. **Hogan**. General Brown, If I could address these to you?

I'm a little concerned about the comparison between the ROTC graduate and the Air Force Academy graduate as a combat officer.

We've had the opportunity to experience this, I'm sure, in Vietnam most recently, and from what all of you have said I gather there must have been a noticeable difference between the non-Academy graduate as a combat aviator and the Academy graduate as a combat aviator in Vietnam.

Would you care to comment on that?

General **Brown**. Yes, sir. We trained the aircrews from both sources, and they performed their combat flying jobs well.

The point I was seeking to make was that the numbers were obviously far greater from other sources than the Academy, but the percent of those individuals who found their way into squadron commanders jobs, wing commanders jobs, was probably higher among those who were commissioned from the Academies than it was with those who were commissioned from other sources.

I don't want to mislead you. They flew well.

Mr. **Hogan**. That's the point, General Brown. General Clark has made a considerable issue on our record of how important it is to train the cadets at the Air Force Academy for the combat role and that, unhappily, you don't have this opportunity in ROTC, at least to such a degree, and I'm just curious how they shaped up when they got into Vietnam in the combat role, both of them the same age, both of them with basically the same training, with the same type of flight school.

Now, in fact, did you notice a difference between your young aviator who was an Air Force Academy graduate from the ROTC graduate, or the one who went directly into flight training?

General **Brown**. Mr. Hogan, you did not notice the difference as you walked through the dining hall and saw who was properly dressed and who was not properly dressed, no, not that sort of thing at all. But in the people who sought responsibility, who did more than their assigned task, yes, I noticed a difference. The people who sought out additional duties were generally—and there are exceptions—there are some great young officers who come from other sources—but I found more products of the Academies, of the several Academies, who sought additional responsibilities, who worked to prepare themselves for the future, and my job over there was to run that Air Force—were Academy graduates, far more so in numbers—and I must say, I'm talking of relatively small numbers in total—and this is noticeable. Yes, sir, it's noticeable.

Mr. **Hogan**. Is it noticeable in the combat role as such, the pure combat role that we're talking about?

General **Brown**. I didn't have the opportunity to watch them in combat.

But let me say that the staff, my staff in the 7th Air Force, was made up in the main of people who came from cockpit jobs. All of our planners, all of our operations controllers in the tactical air control center, the people who wrote the daily operations order, who processed the reports from the mission, all had combat experience, and I could notice it in them, yes.

Now, there were other people on the staff who did the same things they do on staffs here: they administered personnel; they ran the communications system; they handled the computer; all those kind of things. But the noticeable difference—and I don't want to run down the ROTC fellow, nor do I want to say we don't train them well in OTS to handle their job. They do very, very well, both of them. But there is a noticeable number who seek additional responsibility, who work to prepare themselves for the future, and of this number a greater percent are Academy graduates than OTS or ROTC graduates.

This doesn't say that some of our ROTC lads don't do it. There are good ones. We have a lot of good ones. I just say that percentage-wise I would expect to find more of that among the service academy graduates than I would among the ROTC graduates.

Mr. **Hogan**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. Mr. Chairman, I did think of another question.

Mr. **Fisher**. Go ahead, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. We were comparing our country and our military habits, and laws, and so forth, with other countries a few moments ago.

How many other countries do have military academies?

General **Brown**. Korea, Vietnam, I know of. France, the United Kingdom.

General **Clark**. There's 17 in South America alone.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. Is that right? Korea and Vietnam have military academies?

General **Brown**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. Why don't the Laotian generals' sons go to the Vietnam academy then?

General **Brown**. I don't know that they don't have some. They may.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. That's interesting. I didn't realize they had any in Korea or Vietnam.

What's the quality of them?

General **Brown**. By their standards, their quality is exceptionally high. By our standards, I would say it's acceptable. They work hard at it, with our advice and assistance. We have officers who are detailed, or did have, to help them with their programs.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. We've never sent students over to any of the foreign military academies?

General **Brown**. Not to my knowledge. We have to France. General Clark has an exchange program with the French Academy.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. In France?

General **Clark**. Yes, sir. We also have exchange students with the Philippine academy.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. I see.

General **Brown**. And we have a request pending with Argentina. They want to exchange cadets with us.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. **Fisher**. I would assume that most of those countries would gladly accept our Americans if we paid their expenses, if we wanted to send a cadet to those countries to be trained in their military academies. Wouldn't you assume that?

General **Brown**. I think they would be delighted.

Mr. **Fisher**. Off the record.

[Whereupon, a discussion was held off the record.]

Mr. **Fisher**. Let's go back on the record. Mr. Hogan has a few questions for the record, which you can insert.

Mr. **Hogan**. Regarding the potential loss of male input, from an Academy administration point of view—if women are admitted, what objections are there, if any, to increasing the strength of the cadet wing so there would be no loss of male cadets?

General **Clark**. Objections for increasing the strength of the cadet wing are twofold. First, experience with the new increased ceiling for cadet wing strength indicates that the maximum realistic size from a command and control/communications point of view has been reached. Unlike a tried, mature military unit, the cadet wing is composed of inexperienced young men. The management problems would be aggravated by increased size, and going beyond the current authorized ceiling could produce diminishing returns. Second, if such a female program were undertaken, we would anticipate eventually building at an annual rate of 120–150 until we reach a strength of approximately 500 females which would permit representative assignment to each of the 40 cadet squadrons. To increase the wing size so as to offset this total of female cadets, Congress would have to raise the legal ceiling to approximately 5,000. This would require costly construction and time to increase the physical facilities and the permanent party instructor personnel to accommodate such a change.

Mr. **Hogan**. If statutory provisions excluding women from combat are repealed, would there be any real problem in training women at the Academy?

General **Clark**. If public law is changed to permit the use of females in combat, females would be required to take bayonet training; survival, evasion, resistance, and escape (SERE); and unarmed combative courses currently conducted by the Air Force Academy; and would be eligible for Ranger training (Recondo); underwater demolition training/open circuit scuba (UDT/OCS); and T-41 flying training programs. We believe that most females would not be able to complete these combat-training programs due to lack of physical strength. Thus, there would be a real problem in training women at the Academy if statutory provisions excluding women from combat were repealed.

Mr. **Hogan**. How soon could the Academy accommodate women cadets?

General **Clark**. Detailed contingency planning has established that we require a minimum of 18 months leadtime to accommodate the initial input of female cadets. This time is considered to be absolutely essential to properly recruit, test, nominate, select and appoint only the best-qualified females. Thus, a decision by October 1, 1974 would permit the orderly integration of females into the Air Force Academy on July 1, 1976.

Mr. **Hogan**. Is it a fact that substantial numbers of women could qualify for and make a career of military aviation?

[The following information is furnished for the reord:]

Some women may possess the aptitude and physical qualifications to qualify for an aviation career within the Air Force. Statistical data does not exist to prove or disprove that substantial numbers could qualify for an aviation career within the Air Force.

Mr. **Hogan**. In basic flight training, sourcewise—ROTC, OTS, Academies—what is the percentage of the mix?

[The following information is furnished for the record:]

SOURCES OF STUDENTS

[In percent]

	Fiscal year—		
	1973	1974 [1]	1975 [1]
ROTC	41.1	46.2	48.8
Academy	10.4	9.3	22.7
OTS	41.8	36.7	21.3
Active duty	6.7	7.8	7.2

[1] Programed.

Mr. **Hogan**. Furnish any figures you have on pilot losses due to attrition—voluntary, medical, aptitude—between Academy and non-Academy graduates.

[The following information is provided for the record:]

The figures for Fiscal Year 1969–Fiscal Year 1973 are as follows:

UPT ATTRITION BY SOURCE AND CAUSE

FISCAL YEAR 1969

Source	Attrition (percent)	Fly/ Academy	Self-initiated elimination	Medical	Manifestation of apprehension	Other
ROTC	20.9	219	39	46	31	6
SMSO (OTS)	31.7	420	90	71	51	4
Academy	9.5	23	3	2	0	1
Support	24.2	65	13	11	6	0
USAF total	25.7	727	145	130	88	11
ANG	18.4	17	1	7	3	1
RES						
MAP	27.9	37	0	10	3	2
Total	25.0	781	146	147	94	16

FISCAL YEAR 1970

Source	Attrition (percent)	Fly	Academy	Self-initiated elimination	Medical	Manifestation of apprehension	Other
ROTC	21.3	191	5	43	56	20	1
SMSO (OTS)	32.9	448	9	161	118	108	9
Academy	13.2	38	0	5	11	2	2
Support	20.9	44	0	13	14	10	1
USAF total	27.3	721	14	222	199	140	13
ANG	18.3	22	1	3	3	6	0
RES							
MAP	18.0	20	2	0	2	1	0
Total	26.3	763	17	225	204	147	13

FISCAL YEAR 1971

ROTC	21.5	149	13	72	55	34	4
SMSO (OTS)	36.4	562	17	295	116	107	13
Academy	9.1	13	1	12	13	4	4
Support	22.6	35	0	8	7	6	0
USAF total	29.2	759	31	387	191	151	21
ANG	13.4	19	0	0	6	1	2
RES	36.4	22	0	7	3	0	1
MAP	22.0	31	1	0	6	2	2
Total	27.9	831	32	394	206	154	26

FISCAL YEAR 1972

ROTC	20.7	211	4	92	55	34	4
SMSO (OTS)	38.2	484	4	222	116	107	13
Academy	12.7	36	1	11	13	4	4
Support	17.9	41	0	11	7	6	0
USAF total	28.2	771	9	336	191	151	21
ANG	16.u	18	0	3	6	1	2
RFS	29.5	9	0	2	3	0	1
MAP	19.3	37	0	1	6	2	2
Total	27.4	835	9	342	206	154	26

FISCAL YEAR 1973

ROTC	22.6	192	7	78	40	34	7
SMSO (OTS)	36.0	297	10	159	53	53	8
Academy	14.6	30	1	16	6	3	3
Support	16.1	29	1	11	7	8	0
USAF total	27.2	548	19	264	106	98	18
ANG	21.5	41	2	7	7	7	0
RES	23.1	27	1	5	5	1	0
MAP	30.7	72	0	0	7	4	9
Total	26.9	688	22	276	125	110	27

Mr. HOGAN. Do women compete with men in officer promotions?

[The following information is furnished for the record:]

Yes, women do compete with men for officer promotions. They have competed with men since 1947 for promotion to the grade of first lieutenant through lieutenant colonel. In 1967, statutes were repealed to permit women to compete for promotion to colonel which in turn enabled them to be considered for general officer rank.

Over the past 6 years, the selection rates of women have been increasing to where, today, they are selected for temporary promotion to the field grades at selection rates which are comparable to those of nonrated men. For instance, in fiscal year 1974, 32 of 95 eligible women line officers were promoted to the field grades compared to 2,703 nonrated male officers promoted among 6,654 eligibles in the field grades. Thus far the promotion boards for fiscal year 1975 promotion have selected 11 of 47 eligible women line officers in the field grades compared to 779 of 3,464 eligible male nonrated line officers.

Mr. HOGAN. Is there any disadvantage in promotion opportunity for non-Academy graduates?

[The following information is furnished for the record:]

Promotion policies in the Air Force do not provide separate promotion categories for Academy and non-Academy graduates. There is no built-in disadvantage in promotion opportunity for non-Academy graduates. Each officer who is eligible for promotion is considered based upon a review of his entire record of service as a commissioned officer.

However, the Academy graduates do tend to receive a larger share of promotions on the average than do the non-Academy graduates. This is expected in light of the extensive screening involved in selecting young men to enter the Academy, the extensive military training provided by the Academy, and the follow-on utilization of the majority of our Academy graduates in direct combat roles. A review of the percentage of selections of Academy and non-Academy graduates from both the primary and secondary zones of promotions reveals that Academy graduates are selected at a somewhat higher rate to the field grades than non-Academy graduates. Selections from the primary zone for Academy graduates have averaged between 5 and 30 percentage points higher than non-Academy graduates. Selections from the secondary zone of Academy graduates have averaged, over the same 10-year period, between 3 to 5 percentage points higher than non-Academy graduates.

Mr. FISHER. Can you think of anything that may have occurred to you, any of you, that you would like to state in relation to any of the questions that have been asked? Sometimes you think of something that you would like to add to the record. If so, you can do it when you look at your statement.

General BROWN. Thank you very much.

Mr. FISHER. The committee will stand in recess until tomorrow at 10 o'clock, at which time we will hear from the Army.

Secretary McLUCAS. Thank you.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee meeting was adjourned at 11:35 a.m., to reconvene on Wednesday, June 19, 1974, at 10 a.m.]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2,
Washington, D.C., Wednesday, June 19, 1974.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:05 a.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. O. C. Fisher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. FISHER. The committee will come to order.

We have as our witnesses this morning Hon. Howard H. Callaway, Secretary of the Army; Gen. Fred C. Weyand, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army; and Lt. Gen. William A. Knowlton, Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy.

Mr. Secretary, I would like to say at the beginning how deeply grieved the committee is about Gen. Abrams' operation, and we all hope and pray that his recovery will continue, as all indications are that that will be the case.

First, we will receive your statements before any questions are asked, and then we can direct our questions at all of you, or any one of you.

We are just delighted to have you here.

The first witness is Secretary Callaway. You may proceed, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you very much. I'm, of course, delighted to be here with you today.

Mr. Chairman, I especially appreciate your remarks about General Abrams. General Abrams is our No. 1 soldier and a man greatly admired by all Americans, and, as you know, he would be here today because his interest is in West Point. He is recovering well. He is back from the emergency rooms to the regular ward. He is making recovery and gaining strength every day, and the wishes of the Army are, of course, with him.

I do have, in addition to myself, with me here today General Weyand, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, and Lieutenant General Knowlton, Superintendent of West Point. Each of them will make brief statements.

In addition, we have two young men who are available if you or any members of the committee would like to question them. They are 2d Lt. Mike Kirby, who graduated from West Point this month in the class of 1974; and Cadet Steve Townes, who is a first-classman at West Point right now. Obviously, if you have questions, these men are the experts on what's really going on at West Point now.

I would like to offer a brief statement now.

[Biographical data on Secretary Callaway is as follows:]

Howard H. Callaway, Secretary of the Army

Howard H. Callaway was born April 2, 1927, at LaGrange, Georgia. He was graduated from Episcopal High School, Alexandria, Virginia, in 1944. In June of 1949 he received his BS Degree from the United States Military Academy, and was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Regular Army.

Mr. Callaway served in the Infantry during 1949-1952. He is a veteran of the Korean War where he participated in three campaigns while serving as a platoon leader in the 17th Infantry Regiment, 7th Infantry Division. He was awarded the Combat Infantryman's Badge. His last two years in the Army were spent as an instructor at the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Georgia. He was honorably discharged December 19, 1952.

He has long been active in a variety of business, political, educational and civic enterprises. He was named Civilian Aide for the Third Army Area by former Secretary of the Army, Stanley R. Resor, December 18, 1970. He has served as Chairman of the Council of Trustees, Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge; International President of the Young Presidents Organization; and Republican National Committeeman for the State of Georgia. He was the Republican candidate for the Governor of Georgia in 1966. He served in the 89th Congress and represented the Third District of Georgia in 1965-1966.

Mr. Callaway is a former member of the Board of Regents, University System of Georgia; the National 4-H Service Committee and Trustee of the National Recreation Association. Prior to joining the Nixon Administration, he was President of Interfinancial, Inc. of Atlanta, and a Trustee of the Ida Cason Callaway Foundation of Pine Mountain, Georgia.

Mr. Callaway is married to the former Elizabeth Walton of Hamilton, Georgia. They have five children—Elizabeth (23), Howard (21), Edward (18), Virginia (17), and Ralph (14).

Mr. Callaway was sworn in as Secretary of the Army on 15 May 1973.

STATEMENT OF HON. HOWARD H. CALLAWAY, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Secretary CALLAWAY. When talking about equal opportunity in general, or women's rights in particular, the military services need not take a back seat to anyone. The services have led the way, and the Army has been the pace setter among all of them. I would contend that no other institution has actually done more—not talked about, but done more—to advance the cause of women than has the Army. It is a record we can be proud of—and we are. Except for those jobs requiring combat, unusual hazards, or strenuous physical exertions, we employ women interchangeably with men. They are soldiers in every sense except two—they have certain physical limitations that men don't have and we don't want to see them become involved in combat. Ninety-two percent of all Army job specialties are open to women. They command men. They qualify for dependent support just as do male members. They win ROTC scholarships. They attend the Army War College. They wear general's stars.

We have opened up new job opportunities for women at a faster rate, in fact, than the women are prepared to fill them. I would challenge any other institution to match the Army's record in establishing equal opportunity for women.

Lest I leave the wrong impression though, let me hasten to add that this is not a one-way road. The women have been great for the Army, too. They have brought with them into the service much that it needs: skills and attitudes and—yes—charm. Our country has a better Army because of them. Recent opinion polls point to a rising degree of esteem for the military services, and my bet is that we can thank our outstanding women for a good bit of that improving image. I am immensely proud of them and of what they have accomplished.

Nevertheless, I am not willing to change the rules to admit women to West Point. Foremost, perhaps, is my belief that women should not be involved in combat. That belief, I feel sure, is shared by a majority of Americans. The U.S. Military Academy is dedicated to the development of combat leaders. To that end every application for admission to West Point must meet stringent medical and physical entrance requirements for eventual commissioning in the combat arms. That is not to say, however, that every West Point graduate has to enter a combat arm. Each year there will be a very small number in the graduating class who have become physically disqualified for commissioning for duty in a combat role. From time to time there have been other exceptions, but they have been just that—exceptions—and each time the Academy has rather quickly remembered its primary mission and has turned away from the experiment. For example, because of the great concern we have had lately with getting enough doctors, a relaxation of the rules permitted some graduates to go to medical school after graduation. As much as we need doctors, however, that was a mistake. We corrected it last year—no cadet entering after July, 1973—the Class of 1977—will have that option. The Class of 1974, to use our most current example, placed 94 percent of its graduates in branches having a combat role. Of the other 6 percent, 8 graduates opted to become doctors while 39—all of whom had physical disqualifications—entered branches in which they were not likely to be involved directly in combat. Among the 94 percent who were commissioned in combat branches, 38 chose the military intelligence branch, but all of them are required to spend their first 2 years in either the Army or the Infantry, with at least a full year of that duty in a front-line company. All of this is said only by way of being completely open. The fact still remains that West Point's fundamental mission is to produce combat leaders. And it is fulfilling that mission.

We should not be distracted by fringe issues. Some students go through dental school and later become schoolteachers, farmers, or engineers. Some go through medical training only to end up as businessmen or authors. It happens on occasion, I'm told, that some young men and women who get law degrees even turn out to be politicians. But that doesn't alter the need or the reason to have special schools designed to produce dentists or doctors or lawyers. Their professional preparation is unique, and it requires a unique educational environment. No one would seriously consider altering the curriculum or environment of a medical school simply because a graduate now and then was compelled by circumstances or second thoughts to switch to psychology rather than medicine or surgery. Neither should we alter the nature or purpose of the Military Academy simply because a minuscule number of its graduates have for one reason or another not ended up in the combat arms.

There is yet another aspect to the matter. To permit West Point graduates to enter noncombat arms would be diametrically opposed to the Army's current efforts to expand its fighting strength as it trims its supporting overhead. In a time when we have to get the most from every budget dollar, such a diversion of resources is simply not in the best interests of the country. But we are concerned with more here than just money. At issue is the quality of combat leadership. The severe standards set for the West Point cadet are predicated upon his future role as a combat leader. The Academy's primary mission of preparing battle leaders for our Nation's military forces is accomplished through what one can describe as a "single track system" of rigorous, unremitting training. Any reduction of this emphasis in order to accommodate women would in effect lead to the lowering of standards for men by introducing a second and less demanding "track." Inevitably, the product of West Point would be altered.

And that brings up my third reason against admitting women to West Point. We should take a very long look indeed before we tamper with something that has proven over so long a time to be so successful, not only in producing professional military leadership, but in producing generation after generation of generals who have remained invariably supportive of our concept of civilian control over the military. West Point has, beyond any doubt, earned an unparalleled reputation for success. Just to read over the long list of distinguished graduates is to prove my contention. Names like Eisenhower, Bradley, MacArthur, Patton, Pershing, Grant, Lee, and a host of others, come rapidly to mind. West Point graduates won our wars, opened the West, built our railroads, and led the way into space. No other institution in America can match West Point for enduring service to America. Wherever our country faced danger or challenge, West Pointers were there. For nearly as long as we have been a nation, West Point has produced graduates imbued with the spirit of service, devoted to the ageless concept of duty-honor-country. General Douglas MacArthur's farewell address to the Corps of Cadets best summarizes what the Academy is, what it means to those who have studied and matured there, and what we believe it should remain.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to insert General MacArthur's speech into the record. It is an inspirational speech in every way.

Mr. Fisher. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record at this point.

[The address by General MacArthur is as follows:]

Address by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to the Members of the Association of Graduates, U.S.M.A. the Corps of Cadets and Distinguished Guests Upon His Acceptance of the Sylvanus Thayer Award

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York—May 12, 1962

General Westmoreland, General Groves, distinguished guests, and gentlemen of the Corps:

As I was leaving the hotel this morning, a doorman asked me, "Where are you bound for, General?" and when I replied, "West Point," he remarked, "Beautiful place, have you ever been there before?"

No human being could fail to be deeply moved by such a tribute as this. [Thayer Award] Coming from a profession I have served so long, and a people I have loved so well, it fills me with an emotion I cannot express. But this award is not intended primarily to honor a personality, but to symbolize a great moral code—the code of conduct and chivalry of those who guard this beloved land of culture and ancient descent. That is the meaning of this medallion. For all eyes and for all time, it is an expression of the ethics of the American soldier. That I should be integrated in this way with so noble an ideal arouses a sense of pride and yet of humility which will be with me always.

Duty—Honor—Country. Those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be. They are your rallying points: to build courage when courage seems to fail; to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith; to create hope when hope becomes forlorn.

Unhappily, I possess neither that eloquence of diction, that poetry of imagination, nor that brilliance of metaphor to tell you all that they mean. The unbelievers will say they are but words, but a slogan, but a flamboyant phrase. Every pedant, every demagogue, every cynic, every hypocrite, every troublemaker, and, I am sorry to say, some others of an entirely different character, will try to downgrade them even to the extent of mockery and ridicule. But these are some of the things they do. They build your basic character, they mold you for your future roles as the custodians of the nation's defense, they make you strong enough to know when you are weak, and brave enough to face yourself when you are afraid. They teach you to be proud and unbending in honest failure—but humble and gentle in success; not to substitue words for actions, nor to seek the path of comfort, but to face the stress and spur of difficulty and challenge; to learn to stand up in the storm but to have compassion on those who fall; to master yourself before you seek to master others; to have a heart that is clean, a goal that is high; to learn to laugh yet never forget how to weep; to reach into the future yet never neglect the past; to be serious yet never to take yourself too seriously; to be modest so that you will remember the simplicity of true greatness, the open mind of true wisdom, the meekness of true strength. They give you a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination, a vigor of the emotions, a freshness of the deep springs of life, a temperamental predominance of courage over timidity, an appetite for adventure over love of ease. They create in your heart the sense of wonder, the unfailing hope of what next, and the joy and inspiration of life. They teach you in this way to be an officer and a gentleman.

And what sort of soldiers are those you are to lead? Are they reliable, are they brave, are they capable of victory? Their story is known to all of you; it is the story of the American man-at-arms. My estimate of him was formed on the battlefield many, many years ago, and has never changed. I regarded him then as I regard him now—as one of the world's noblest figures, not only as one of the finest military characters but also as one of the most stainless. His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty he gave—all that mortality can give. He needs no eulogy from me or from any other man. He has written his own history and written it in red on his enemy's breast. But when I think of his patience under adversity, of his courage under fire, and of his modesty in victory, I am filled with an emotion of admiration I cannot put into words. He belongs to history as furnishing one of the greatest examples of successful patriotism; he belongs to posterity as the instructor of future generations in the principles of liberty and freedom; he belongs to the present, to us, by his virtues and by his achievements. In 20 campaigns, on a hundred battlefields, around a thousand campfires, I have witnessed that enduring fortitude, that patriotic self-abregation, and that invincible determination which have carved his statue in the hearts of his people. From one end of the world to the other he has drained deep the chalice of courage.

As I listened to those songs of the glee club, in memory's eye I could see those staggering columns of the First World War, bending under soggy packs on many a weary march from dripping dusk to drizzling dawn, slogging ankle-deep through the mire of shell-shocked roads, to form grimly for the attack, blue-lipped, covered with sludge and mud, chilled by the wind and rain; driving home to their objective and, for many, to the judgement seat of God. I do not know the dignity of their birth but I do know the glory of their death. They died unquestioning, uncomplaining, with faith in their hearts, and on their lips the hope that we would go on to victory. Always for them—Duty—Honor—Country; always their blood and sweat and tears as we sought the way and the light and the truth.

And 20 years after, on the other side of the globe, again the filth of murky foxholes, the stench of ghostly trenches, the slime of dripping dugouts; those boiling suns of relentless heat, those torrential rains of devastating storms; the loneliness and utter desolation of jungle trails, the bitterness of long separation from those they loved and cherished, the deadly pestilence of tropical disease, the horror of stricken areas of war; their resolute and determined defense, their swift and sure attack, their indomitable purpose, their complete and decisive victory—always victory. Always through the bloody haze of their last reverberating shot, the vision of gaunt, ghastly men reverently following your password of Duty—Honor—Country.

The code which those words perpetuate embraces the highest moral laws and will stand the test of any ethics or philosophies ever promulgated for the uplift of mankind. Its requirements are for the things that are right, and its restraints are from the things that are wrong. The soldier, above all other men, is required to practice the greatest act of religious training—sacrifice. In battle and in the face of danger and death, he discloses those divine attributes which his Maker gave when he created man in his own image. No physical courage and no brute instinct can take the place of the Divine help which alone can sustain him. However horrible the incidents of war may be, the soldier who is called upon to offer and to give his life for his country, is the noblest development of mankind.

You now face a new world—a world of change. The thrust into outer space of the satellite, spheres and missiles marked the beginning of another epoch in the long story of mankind—the chapter of the space age. In the five or more billions of years the scientists tell us it has taken to form the earth, in the three or more billion years of development of the human race, there has never been a greater, a more abrupt or staggering evolution. We deal now not with the things of this world alone, but with the illimitable distances and as yet unfathomed mysteries of the universe. We are reaching out for a new and boundless frontier. We speak in strange terms: of harnessing the cosmic energy; of making winds and tides work for us; of creating unheard synthetic materials to supplement or even replace our old standard basics; of purifying sea water for our drink; of mining ocean floors for new fields of wealth and food; of disease preventatives to expand life into the hundred of years; of controlling the weather for a more equitable distribution of heat and cold, of rain and shine; of space ships to the moon; of the primary target in war, no longer limited to the armed forces of an enemy, but instead to include his civil populations; of ultimate conflict between a united human race and the sinister forces of some other planetary galaxy; of such dreams and fantasies as to make life the most exciting of all time.

And through all this welter of change and development, your mission remains fixed, determined, inviolable—it is to win our wars. Everything else in your professional career is but corollary to this vital dedication. All other public purposes, all other public projects, all other public needs, great or small, will find others for their accomplishment; but you are the ones who are trained to fight: yours is the profession of arms—the will to win, the sure knowledge that in war there is no substitute for victory; that if you lose, the nation will be destroyed; that the very obsession of your public service must be Duty—Honor—Country. Others will debate the controversial issues, national and international, which divide men's minds; but serene, calm, aloof, you stand as the nation's war-guardian, as its lifeguard from the raging tides of international conflict, as its gladiator in the arena of battle. For a century and a half you have defended, guarded, and protected its hallowed traditions of liberty and freedom, of right and justice. Let civilian voices argue the merits or demerits of our processes of government; whether our strength is being sapped by deficit financing, indulged in too long, by federal paternalism grown too mighty, by power groups grown too arrogant, by politics grown too corrupt, by crime grown too rampant, by morals grown too low, by taxes grown too high, by extremists grown too violent; whether our personal liberties are as thorough and complete as they should be. These great national problems are not for your professional participation or military solution. Your guidepost stands out like a ten-fold beacon in the hight—Duty—Honor—Country.

You are the leaven which binds together the entire fabric of our national system of defense. From your ranks come the great captains who hold the nation's destiny in their hands the moment the war tocsin sounds. The Long Grey Line has never failed us. Were you to do so, a million ghosts in olive drab, in brown khaki, in blue and gray, would rise from their white crosses thundering those magic words—Duty—Honor—Country.

This does not mean that you are war mongers. On the contrary, the soldier, above all other people, prays for peace, for he must suffer and bear the deepest wounds and scars of war. But always in our ears ring the ominous words of Plato that wisest of all philosophers, "Only the dead have seen the end of War."

The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished tone and tint; they have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were. Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears, and coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday. I listen vainly for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll. In my dreams I hear again the crash of guns, the rattle of musketry, the strange, mournful mutter of the battlefield.

But in the evening of my memory, always I come back to West Point. Always there are echoes and re-echoes Duty—Honor—Country.

Today marks my final roll call with you, but I want you to know that when I cross the river my last conscious thoughts will be of The Corps, and The Corps, and The Corps.

I bid you farewell.

Secretary CALLAWAY. Let there be no doubt in anyone's mind about one thing. Admitting women to West Point would irrevocably change the Academy. And all the evidence seems to say that the change could only be for the worse. The Spartan atmosphere—which is so important to producing the final product—would surely be diluted, and would in all probability disappear before long. To modify the curriculum and alter the training so as to permit women to attend would weaken or destroy that intangible but indelible spirit which is the unmistakable hallmark of West Point graduates. Each future second lieutenant must have the same sturdy qualities—mental toughness and physical capacity—that have marked West Point's graduates for nearly two centuries. He must have the strength to endure and the will to persevere. The dangers of today's world are not less than those of the past, our country is no less in need of defense—now is not the time to relax our standards.

Mr. Chairman, I have stated our position regarding the admission of women to the Military Academy. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have

Mr. FISHER. We will first hear from the other witnesses, and then we will proceed with questions.

Gen. Fred C. Weyand, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, is our next witness. We are glad to have you, General. You may proceed.

[Autobiographical data on General Weyand is as follows:]

GENERAL FRED C. WEYAND, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

General Fred C. Weyand was born in Arbuckle, California, 15 September 1916. He was commissioned a second lieutenant on graduation from the University of California in 1938 and entered on active duty in December 1940. In 1944 and 1945 he was assigned to various units in China, Burma, and India.

After World War II, his assignments included duty with the War Department; Headquarters, US Army, Pacific; Joint Task Force 7; and the staff of the Commander in Chief, Pacific.

During the Korean conflict, he served with the 3rd Infantry Division in Japan and Korea in 1950 and 1951.

In 1954 following duty as an instructor at the Infantry School, he was assigned to the Office of the Secretary of the Army.

From 1958 to 1960, General Weyand was assigned in West Berlin as Commanding Officer, 3rd Battle Group, 6th Infantry; as assistant to the U.S. Commander, Berlin; and in France as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army Communications Zone. He then served as Chief of Legislative Liaison at Department of the Army.

From 1964 to 1967 General Weyand commanded the 25th Infantry Division in Hawaii and South Vietnam. In May 1967, he assumed command of II Field Force Vietnam. In late 1968 he became Chief, Office of Reserve Components. In 1969 and early 1970 he was Military Advisor to the Chairman, U.S. Delegation, U.S. Embassy, Paris, France.

Following brief service in mid-1970 as Assistant Chief of Staff for Force Development, Department o the Army, he returned to Vietnam as Deputy Commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command Vietnam. In June 1972 he was appointed Commander, USMACV.

In March 1973, after withdrawal of U.S. forces from the Republic of Vietnam, he assumed command of the United States Army, Pacific. General Weyand was sworn in as the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army on 1 August 1973.

General Weyand has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Silver Star, and numerous other U.S. and foreign decorations.

General WEYAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

Let me say first, sir, that I, too, deeply appreciate your interest and concern in General Abrams' situation, and I, too, regret that he could not be here this morning because, as the Secretary says, he is our No. 1 soldier, and I know that he would have brought you insights that would have been helpful.

Abe and I share a conviction with respect to the issues before you. We have admittedly arrived at that conviction from different heritages because, as you know, General Abrams is a graduate of the Military Academy and I am an ROTC officer.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to paraphrase my statement simply in the interest of brevity, if you don't mind.

Mr. FISHER. Very well.

STATEMENT OF GEN. FRED C. WEYAND, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

General WEYAND. As the Secretary has stated, the Army is very proud of its lead role in desegregation, in support of racial equality, in equal employment opportunity, and in all of these other sensitive areas involving social justice and equality. In implementing these changes that have involved changing deeply held attitudes, we have consistently tried to avoid anachronisms that in any way would tend to be taken as tokenism. For example, in making ROTC scholarships available to young women, the Army has made it possible for the women of our country who are properly qualified and motivated to pursue a military career. The extent to which we presently recruit and admit women to other programs—ROTC, most enlisted specialities, and so on—and the efforts that we have made to make the volunteer Army a success, are evidence of the value that we place upon our servicewomen and their equality.

As I view it, the issue of whether women should become cadets at West Point is tied directly to the basic question of whether Americans are prepared to commit their daughters to combat. I am not prepared to do that. And I hope that that is the sentiment of most Americans.

The Military Academy has, indeed, the distinctive and necessary mission of educating and training—preparing—and I underline "preparing," Mr. Chairman—officers for combat roles. That is its predominant purpose; and, as such, it has a unique place in our overall military educational system. Since combat is the main element that distinguishes military service from other professions, it seems reasonable that the Army's only Academy be devoted to the preparation of combat leaders. If West Point is not devoted to producing combat leaders, our country has no institution dedicated to doing it, and in today's world we need at least one place where duty—to the point of death—is placed above all other personal considerations.

As long as it is the desire of our people, expressed through the Congress, that women not be employed in combat roles or positions, it seems to me that it would be a waste of a scarce and costly resource to divert any of the Academy's capability and potential to a secondary and lesser mission. Adding the training of women for noncombat roles would dilute the principal efforts of the Academy, and would reduce the number of officers trained at West Point for this unique experience of combat leadership, and I do not recommend it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. Thank you, General Weyand.

We are now honored and pleased to hear from the very distinguished Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy, Lt. Gen. William A. Knowlton, who, I believe, has occupied that position longer than any other man in modern history. Is that correct, General?

General **Knowlton**. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. For how long? Over 4 years?

General **Knowlton**. Yes, sir; the longest since the 1930's.

Mr. **Fisher**. That's highly commendable.

The General, as many of you know, will be leaving this post in the near future for an assignment in Germany. I know that there will be a lot of people connected with West Point, and who appreciate what is happening at West Point, who will be sorry to see you leaving that assignment, General. But we certainly wish you the best in the future.

General **Knowlton**. Mr. Chairman, I thank you very much, sir, for those kind words.

As you have mentioned, I've been the Superintendent for well over 4 years now. This is the longest time, since General Connor in the 1930's.

I might say, only somewhat facetiously, that I also, in common with my civilian counterparts, have been sued more than any superintendent in history, so that is a qualification for my appearance here today, sir.

[Laughter.]

Mr. **Fisher**. Very well. You may proceed with your statement. we're delighted to have you.

General **Knowlton**. Thank you very much, sir.

[Biographical data on General Knowlton is as follows:]

LT. GEN. WILLIAM A. KNOWLTON, SUPERINTENDENT, U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

Lieutenant General William A. Knowlton was born in Weston, Massachusetts, June 19 1920. He graduated from the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, in January 1943, seventh in a class of 409, and was commissioned in the United States Army as a second lieutenant of Cavalry.

During World War II, he was a member of the 87th Cavalry Reconnaissance Squadron (Mechanized), 7th Armored Division. General Knowlton then served as regimental S-3 and Motor Battalion Commander in Berlin. This was followed by a year as Counter-Intelligence Staff Officer in the European Theater Headquarters.

In 1947, he returned to the United States and for two and a half years was Assistant Secretary of the Army General Staff in Washington.

In January, 1951, General Knowlton was assigned to Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE) in France for three and a half years. From 1954-1955, he attended the Regular Course at the Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. For the next three years, he was Associate Professor of Social Sciences at the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York.

In 1958, he took command of 1st Battalion, 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment at Fort Meade, Maryland. He then attended the National War College, graduating in 1960.

Following attendance at the Strategic Intelligence School, General Knowlton served for two years as Army Attache and Chief of Military Assistance in Tunisia. On his return in 1963, he assumed command of the 1st Armor Traning Brigade at Fort Knox, Kentucky.

In 1964 he returned to the Army General Staff as Division Chief in the Directorate of Coordination and Analysis. He served in the Office of the Secretary of Defense in 1965. From August 1966 to January 1968 he served in Vietnam on the Staff of United States Military Assistance Command.

General Knowlton became Assistant Division Commander of the 9th Infantry Division in Vietnam in January 1968. From July 1968 to March 1970 he served as Secretary of the Army General Staff in Washington. He was appointed as the 49th Superintendent of the United States Military Academy on 23 March 1970.

General Knowlton has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Bronze Star with V Device, the Air Medal with "9" Device, the Army Commendation medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Fourragere of the Belgian Croix de Guerre, Distinguished Unit Badge, the Vietnamese National Order 5th Class, the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with Palm, the Vietnamese Unit Gallantry Badge, and the Vietnamese Unit Civil Action Honor Badge 1st Class.

STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. WILLIAM A. KNOWLTON, SUPERINTENDENT, U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

General KNOWLTON. It's an honor for me to appear here this morning, and I am grateful for this opportunity to present a brief statement on the subject of the admission of females to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

The Secretary of the Army and the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army have discussed the unique, indispensable functions performed by the Military Academy in developing combat leaders for our Nation's Army. In accordance with the needs of the Army, Academy graduates are expected to serve in a combat role and their training is expressly tailored for that purpose.

Although West Point is a fully accredited and highly respected institution of higher education, it is not solely a college. It is a military institution; a total, full-time training environment for our future combat leaders. Everyone at the Academy is dedicated to this carefully planned and integrated "whole man" concept of education. Though it is difficult to convey a complete picture of all aspects of the West Point program, I would like to provide some details of this extensive military and academic educational process, particularly as it applies to the issue being discussed here today.

The curriculum offered at West Point reflects the changing requirements of the military profession and the latest advances in the field of higher learning. It comprises a basic foundation for a continuing program of education and professional development throughout a graduate's lifetime career in the Army.

During his 4 years at the Academy, a cadet takes an average of 160 semester credit hours, which compares with an average of about 148 hours at a comparable civilian college. He is also involved in more than 2,000 contact hours of military training during his four summers; more than 260 hours, in addition, of drill and ceremony; and a minimum of 242 hours of intramural, intercollegiate, or club athletics.

Beginning with the summer preceding his first academic year and continuing throughout his career as a cadet, his military training emphasizes those individual and leadership skills that are required of a combat leader. New cadet barracks, as that first summer is called, includes intensive training in basic military skills and physical conditioning. No candidate is accepted for admission to the academy who is not already fully qualified medically for such an assignment, and no candidate is accepted for admission whose physical condition is such that he cannot reasonably be expected to withstand the rigors of the 4-year program and be fully qualified upon graduation for such an assignment. This 7-week period, which begins in July, this year on the 8th of July, is characterized by rigid discipline and close and constant supervision. These are grueling days, both mentally and physically, for the young men and, historically, approximately 10 percent of them have been unable or unwilling to make the grade throughout that summer period. The day begins at 5:50 a.m. and ends at 9:30 p.m.; throughout the summer, their day starts with a physical conditioning period—with and without arms—before breakfast. This progressive program culminates in a 40-minute, 5-mile run in August. Field training during new cadet barracks includes 4 conditioning marches over tough terrain—the longest being 11 kilometers—plus 2 final 15 kilometer road marches, weapons familiarization, squad tactical training, land navigation training, survival training, and 6 hours of rigorous bayonet training, including pugil stick drills and the running of a bayonet combat course against upper class "targets" using pugil sticks.

The third class, or sophomore, summer training at Camp Buckner, our field training facility at West Point, provides the cadet with an indoctrination in advanced individual soldiering skills, familiarity with the responsibilities of the platoon leader and with leadership development through practical experience in a field environment. The highlights of the program at Camp Buckner are Recondo, or Ranger training, which includes hand-to-hand combat, and 5-day and night extended patrolling problem conducted over rugged mountainous terrain. This training stresses high standards of physical conditioning, self-confidence, self-discipline, and esprit. The cadet receives his first introduction to the active Army during a 1-week trip to Fort Knox, Ky., where he undergoes air defense artillery training and combined arms training in armor, cavalry, and air cavalry tactics and techniques.

The second class, or junior, summer training provides the cadet with an opportunity to develop military skills, experience, and self-confidence, and to test and develop his leadership abilities in an active Army environment. This experience is gained through attendance at one of six service schools and through a program which we call Army orientation training. Training options include airborne, ranger, northern warfare—in Alaska—New Viking, which is a field exercise conducted by the Canadian Army north of the Arctic Circle, flight training and jungle school. Approximately 63 percent of the class attend either ranger, jungle, or airborne training. During Army orientation training, cadets are assigned to active Army units and participate, for example, as platoon leaders in infantry, armor, and artillery units throughout the United States, Europe, and Panama.

The physical education program at West Point is tough and demanding even for our male cadets. During the first academic year all cadets are required to take 20 lessons each of boxing, wrestling, swimming, and gymnastics. The physical requirements for all four of these courses are high and the grading scales for boxing and wrestling are based on actual competition among the cadets.

Adm. **Worth Bagley**. None that haven't been discussed in that context, Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Do you see the need for more officers of higher rank in the Navy? We're attracting womenpower to fill out our manpower requirements in going to the All-Volunteer services. As you get more women in the uniform of the service, you're going to need more officers and senior officers who are women.

Would this hold true in the Navy, or is there some policy there?

Adm. **Worth Bagley**. In the program that we're following now for women, we are experiencing a very significant increase. In fiscal year 1975, there will be about a 50-percent increase in women officers since fiscal year 1972. Over the same period, the numbers of enlisted women will triple.

Mr. **Dickinson**. You expect to increase your women officers 50 percent. You say it has nothing to do with the Academy, whether they are admitted to the Academy or not. Would it be an advantage, though, to have women graduates from the Academy, over the candidates that you are getting now?

Adm. **Worth Bagley**. In the context that we have talked about, under the current law, we wouldn't think so. We would think it would be much more efficient to go ahead and train women officers as we're doing it.

It costs $62,000 to train an individual at the Naval Academy; $21,000 in the NROTC scholarship program, and about $7,000 now to train a WAVE at the OCS. The ROTC has only been in effect now only for a few years.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Are you being successful in attracting women to your ROTC program?

Adm. **Worth Bagley**. Very successful, and there are five or six applicants for every one that is chosen.

But one of the main arguments, Mr. Dickinson, I think, for continuing the trend that we have now, at least under the circumstances of the present law, is this question of cost, because there are somewhere between 30 to 75 percent of the currently authorized naval officer billets to which women can't, either legally or rationally, be assigned.

On the opposite side of that coin, if we put a man in the Naval Academy for that same $62,000, he has the potential of filling 100 percent of officer billets.

So, looking at it from the manager's standpoint, we think what we are doing now is reasonable and rational.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's all I have.

Secretary **Middendorf**. Mr. Dickinson, if I could just add to that, following the Chairman's suggestion?

At the present time approximately 25 percent of the women who are in the Navy, are officers. For the entire Navy, men and women combined, about 8 percent are officers. Two-thirds of the women in the officer corps are in the healing arts area, primarily nursing areas, highly specialized.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Thank you.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mrs. Holt?

Mrs. **Holt**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's certainly a pleasure to have you gentlemen with us this morning, and I'm very proud to have the Naval Academy in the Fourth District they enjoy, having gone through the training experience you so well described, General, and we will do that a little later.

I have two or three questions, and then we will pass this around because we might run into a time situation later on.

General Knowlton, you and Mr. Secretary and General Weyand have put great emphasis on the combat training aspect of West Point, I think a little more so than has been true with the other Academy spokesmen, although they have all emphasized that.

Perhaps the combat training for the Army would of necessity be a little more rigorous than for the other services.

Is that a fair statement? You are training them for infantry activity in the rice paddies, under extreme conditions, that might or might not apply to the other services. Is it fair to say that in the case of the Army you do require training somewhat more rigorous in terms of preparation for combat?

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, let me say a word about that, others might also want to comment.

The combat arms in the Army, as you are well aware, are the infantry, air defense, field artillery, and armor, and, without trying to make a comparison with the other services, which I would not be qualified to do, I would think it's a fair statement to say that the ground combat environment is an environment that requires the very best of every possible attribute a young leader can have. As a platoon leader, as a company commander, as a battalion commander, a young man is put into a situation of enormous stress, enormous confusion, enormous physical endurance and hardship, and in a position where he knows that every minute the lives of a great many men are directly under this command, and he is directly responsible for what happens to them.

Without comparing with other services, I think it's fair to say that the ground combat environment puts a man to every test that a man can be put to.

Mr. FISHER. Very Well.

I certainly didn't mean to downgrade or detract from the combat training that's accorded to the other services. They're very good and very comparable, but I wondered if the type of assignments of the Army in the infantry in the field doesn't require a little different kind of training and preparation than might be true of those who don't engage in that kind of rigorous activity.

General KNOWLTON. May I add a little bit to that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

General KNOWLTON. I think you have pointed out something which is very important, as well as being true. The ground combat environment is a tough, mean, demanding, stressful physical environment, and I think its effect at West Point in the training is not only within the combat training but appears particularly in the educational program which we have at West Point, and in the demanding physical requirements which are placed upon applicants for West Point prior to their coming in. We go to the Army and find out the skills that are required of the young officer in a combat requirement. Then we come back and design the physical education program from the requirement for those skills.

And so when one talks about things like pullups, which are difficult for women to perform, pushups, other things that involve upper body strength, they are in our program not arbitrarily; they are in our program because they are an important part of producing the kind of strength that a combat leader needs in today's combat environment within the Army.

Mr. FISHER. Very well, General.

Someone told me that a Member of Congress was recently quoted as saying that graduates of West Point rarely ever get hurt, because officers don't get out where they are exposed to the shooting.

Would you have any comment to make on exposure that West Point graduates have?

General KNOWLTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that you asked that question because I think this is a very important part of the whole question of who should serve in combat. No discussion of that would be complete without some discussion of casualties, because, as you know, our recent experience is that the Army bears the brunt of casualties, and, therefore, this is a very important consideration.

I did a little research prior to coming down on that very subject, and found that the death toll among officers is considerably higher than one might realize. I saw an analysis of the Vietnam battles deaths, for example, that indicated that over half of the casualties were either commissioned leaders or non-commissioned leaders.

So it is the leaders who suffer and are in the positions of exposure in ground combat.

The West Point classes which graduate in time to furnish the platoon leaders and company commanders to a fighting Army suffer the heaviest proportionate casualties, and I speak from personal experience on this. In my own class of January 1943, for example, within 24 months of our graduation nearly 40 percent of the class had been wounded or killed. The class which preceded ours, which graduated in June of 1942, had approximately one-third dead or wounded by 1945. The class which followed ours, June 1943, had approximately 48 percent dead or wounded within 18 months of graduation.

There are some overall statistics, I think, that are of interest to you and should perhaps be in the record. In World War II, of the 35,984 combat-related officer deaths in our Army, 488 were West Point graduates, and 58 percent of those West Pointers were in the grade of major or above, and 10 were general officers.

I believe this is important because sometimes, I think, one tends to believe that perhaps only junior officers are exposed to these hazards.

In the Korean war there were 1,535 officers killed, and, again, over 10 percent, 157, were West Point graduates, and of these 157 over 10 percent were majors or above, and 2 were general officers.

In the Vietnam war, again the West Point graduate deaths were just less than 10 percent of the officer deaths. Officers killed numbered 3,406, of whom 273 were West Point graduates, and one-fourth of those West Point graduates were in the rank of major or above, and two were general officers.

Thus, West Pointers will provide, roughly, 45 percent of the input into the Regular Army second lieutenant ranks, around which the expanded Army will be built, and yet the classes which graduate in the time of war, move to active leadership of our combat arms and suffer more proportionately in dead and wounded.

In the Vietnam war, I don't think you'll find another educational institution in the country which has anything like the figures, of the graduates killed, in the fighting which the single institution of West Point has suffered in that period.

So if a woman were to graduate from West Point and be commissioned in the combat arms, then she will run the same high risk of battlefield death which has faced all West Point graduates in time of war, and the hazard is not one which stops, as I mentioned, at the junior grades, but which continues into the field grades and on even into the general officer ranks.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you. That's very interesting, and, I think, very proper testimony to be put in the record, in view of the purpose that this committee has in mind of trying to determine all aspects of the risks and the ability of those who are assigned to combat missions to perform properly.

Now I think I'll ask the $64 question, and then pass it around, because I don't want to take up that much time.

Granting that all of this is true, that, Mr. Secretary, you do have that problem of possible dilution of that Spartan spirit that is so famous at West Point, now explain to this committee why admitting women, having them training there side by side, would dilute that spirit, or would interfere with the functions that you have described in preparing them for combat, assuming that they want to assume that role, which they obviously would be expected to if they were admitted to West Point.

Why can you say categorically that therefore they shouldn't be admitted, because it would dilute the Spartan spirit that exists there?

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to that question.

I would like to start off, in responding, by saying that I feel sure that this subcommittee, and this committee as a whole, would realize that I have attempted in every way that I possibly could since becoming Secretary of the Army to cooperate openly, in a very open way, with this committee and with this Congress, and if the Congress should require, by legislation, for us to admit women we would cooperatively obey our mandate.

I don't think, however, that this Congress, or the Members of this Congress, have thought through the full question of admitting women to West Point. I perceive that there are Members of Congress who look at it in very different ways. I perceive that all Members of Congress and all of us want to do the right thing for women, and because of that people just naturally want West Point to admit women, and I think that there are Members of Congress and members of the public at large who are responding to that want, would like to do it, but haven't thought it out. And I think even in this committee there are some who are proponents of women at West Point, who expect that if women come to West Point, they will have the same precise standards; they will be expected to participate, in a form appropriate for women, but to participate in the kinds of things that General Knowlton said, and that we would only admit those women who are extremely capable physically, who could roughly compare with present cadets, and could adhere to the same kind of schedule.

We all know that there are some women like that, a smaller number than there are of men; and that is perceived by some who are supporting it, and they say, "Yes. Let these women go on and become combat officers," and they have not really thought out what it means in a combat environment to young men who are scared to death and look up and see that new officer coming in, not as a combat associate, but as a combat leader, responsible for everything that happens to their lives.

And, if not fully thought out, the implications of a woman in combat, then West Point could still be Spartan. But the effect is in the combat area, where again, I will repeat, we need every ounce of energy we can get for our combat leaders in this very difficult situation.

That is one track that people are thinking, and that would not dilute the Spartan effort, but it would change what happens to a combat officer. But I think that needs to be thought out, and we in the Army do not recommend that at all.

There are others who support it who have said, "Well, let's just have, out of the regiment, a battalion of women, and let's have 200, 300, 500 women who are there; and they are women and they don't go into combat for the reasons you give about combat, but they have the other advantages of a West Point education, and they can be West Point graduates and infiltrate the Army with the kinds of good things that a West Point education is perceived to do," but I am not sure that they have thought out the implications there, because, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, that would totally change the spirit of West Point, the Spartan atmosphere of West Point, the rigorousness of West Point, because, in my opinion, there's no way that you can have 300, 400, or 500 women who are physically qualified to do the kinds of things that General Knowlton has testified to, and if I'm correct and they are not physically able to do those kinds of things, then there is a different kind of West Point for them. There is no longer one West Point. There are two West Points, a very different West Point one like ROTC with high academic standards, but not with the rigorousness, the Spartanness, the training of duty-honor-country, the spirit of being the hardcore that has made up the kind of leadership that inspires the ROTC and OCS graduates to all become equal officers in the Army as you go forward. Then West Point has been changed and, in my judgment, changed for the worse.

If that is done, I think there's another element that has not been thought through. If we establish a second track, and, say, we have these 300 or 400 women, who have less physically demanding training, I don't know how we would exclude a man who wanted to enter on that same track, and I think it would only be a matter of time before we would have diluted all of West Point to that lower track.

On the one hand, we've got what would be accused of being tokenism and all the problems that involves. On the other hand, we've got a dilution of what West Point now means.

And I go back to my original testimony, Mr. Chairman: If you've got something that the public perceives is good for this country, that's working—and West Point is working, it has never failed this country—I think it's a little dangerous to make such a fundamental change in something that has been that good for the country.

Mr. Fisher. Very well, Mr. Secretary.

I think we all know on the committee, but for the record, you yourself, you are a graduate of West Point, are you not?

Secretary Callaway. Yes, sir, that is correct. And I would say, without being emotional, in answer to the previous question you asked, that many of my class, the first assignment that we had in my class—and we graduated in a peacetime class—was in Korea, and I lost in my own class in the first 3 months in Korea 10 percent of my company classmates. We were prepared to do this; it was part of what we understood was our assignment.

But I get a little perturbed when I see people who say the West Point graduates have the easy jobs and don't take the combat jobs.

Mr. Fisher. General, would you have any comment in response to the question I posed to the Secretary?

General Knowlton. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary has been so eloquent that I hesitate to add to what he's said for fear that I would dilute it, just as he would fear dilution of the standards at West Point.

But I believe one of the most important aspects of West Point throughout our history has been the homogeneity of shared standards at West Point. When a young man graduates and has the seal of approval, each graduate has been through all of the various things which go to make up a West Point graduate.

There are two particular areas of concern to me when we discuss women. One, as I have mentioned, is the physical education program, which is where the first obstacles arise almost immediately, and, as I say, our physical education program was not devised arbitrarily, but is very closely linked to the qualities required on the battlefield. There are many of the things we do where the emphasis is on bodily contact sports, on that kind of thing which is very important in producing this espirit of the combat leader at the small unit level.

I just noticed the other day an article in the American Medical Association Journal of June 3, which was approved by the Women's and Girl's Division of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, in which they pointed out that girls who participate on a boys' team, with its inordinate injury risk, jeopardize their health and safety and this outweighs the benefits of such participation.

This article also mentioned that while during preadolescence there is no essential difference between the work capacity of boys and girls, following puberty there is a different situation, and that most boys surpass girls in all athletic performance characteristics.

Inevitably when we get into the physical qualification area, or into the physical education area, we find ourselves unable to have girls qualify and to participate on the same basis. It would result in a "second track," and I would be very strongly against that, Mr. Chairman, for all of the reasons which the Secretary has stated. The West Point experience is one experience shared by all.

Mr. Fisher. Thank you, General.

Mr. Daniel.

Mr. Dan Daniel. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I notice on page 3 of your statement you talk about students in training for a mission and then winding up in something else, and you conclude that thought by saying, "It happens on occasion, I'm told, that some young men and women who get law degrees even turn out to be politicians." I might add that we have some West Pointers who have become politicians, and good ones, although they might be counted out in another war.

[Laughter.]

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Daniel, you're speaking of Congressman Murphy, I'm certain.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Yes; I am.

Seriously, Mr. Secretary, when the HEW issued guidelines this week, called "Sex Equality Amendment," title 9 of the Higher Education Act of 1972, they totally exempted all military schools and colleges, including service academies.

What's the significance you attached to that?

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Daniel, I've not had an opportunity to read that, and it would be difficult to attach full significance to it.

My immediate reaction would be that those who promulgated that regulation felt that some of the arguments of the type that General Knowlton has been making are valid, that a military academy is different from another kind of school, and that there are valid reasons why women should not participate in a military academy in the same way that they could in a normal civilian academic community.

I will say that I have no special expertise in that area, however.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. General Weyand, how would you define the combat role?

General WEYAND. I would say for the Army it's defined by the arms of infantry, air defense, artillery, and armor, which make up the specific branches of our service that are combat.

Going beyond that though, to possibly give you more of a subjective answer for the role of combat, in the Army it has to do with those elements that are expected to look at the enemy face-to-face, that are actually engaged in active maneuvering plus the immediate support of those maneuver elements which are in close physical contact with the enemy forces.

This whole business of what is a combat role, of course, is very pertinent to the issues that you are considering, because we repeat over and over again that we do not believe that our daughters, or our women, should engage in combat. At least, that's my sentiment.

I might just expand on this, again, from the subjective viewpoint. I'm an ROTC officer. I think back on my view of the Military Academy. Why was it any better, or any different from my own university, the University of California at Berkeley? For some reason or another, all through the years that I have been in the Army I have looked on West Point as the touchstone of integrity, of duty, of honor, or country: these things that we hear about, and of these other inner strengths and inner disciplines that I have found men must have to lead other men.

Now, that is not to say that I don't feel that I do not possess those qualities, because I think I do, and I think other ROTC graduates who become leaders do.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. You're not saying these qualities are absent in women?

General WEYAND. They're not absent in women. The Academy, different from my own university, prepares men in a way that causes them to live, to experience these qualities. I was educated to understand them, but I did not, as I look back on my college education, live them day in and day out. So I go back to West Point as a touchstone, for the setting of standards, the ultimate standards that combat leaders must aspire to if they are to lead men in combat successfully.

Now, unfortunately, we don't very often reach those standards and those heights, but that institution is precious to us beyond description because it is there setting those standards for all the rest of us. It's almost like it was the core of one of these circular high-rise buildings that gives strength to everything that hangs from it. The graduates of that institution and the institution itself has given me, at times, inspiration. They and it have set an example that as I moved along in my own way I tried to emulate and respond to.

I'm an infantryman and, as those of you who have been in the infantry know—and I know most of you have been in or around it—our motto is "Follow me." It's difficult to articulate what that is all about. Part of the issue before us here is equality and social justice for our women and the need to provide them an opportunity to pursue a military profession, or goals in that profession, if that's what they want. And being an ROTC graduate, I belive that we have that wonderful opportunity and alternative in the ROTC.

Part of the "Follow me" motto, though, has to do with the followers. The leader must be someone who—and again it's very difficult to grasp—must have those qualities that will cause men to follow him or her on belief and faith, to go into situations where they will follow him unto death. He has to have a quality, or the qualities, that cause men to want to follow his example, that enables him to, in a sense, transfer his own power, his own qualities, into lesser men at a time of crisis. He has to be a man who is prepared to do everything that he asks of his men, and more.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. General, you have women in ROTC, do you not?

General WEYAND. Yes, we do.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. What's the difference between having them in ROTC and having them in the Military Academy?

General WEYAND. The difference is that we are providing an opportunity for them to pursue the military profession in so many alternate ways that I would think could satisfy most any woman. At the same time it does not dilute the output from the Military Academy.

The chairman asked a question about in what way would the presence of women dilute the Spartan atmosphere of the Military Academy. I can only say, in addition to what has already been said, that it dilutes it to the extent that it would lessen the output from that Academy into our Armed Forces.

Again I go back to the point that those graduates are a very precious commodity and beyond that, sit, come back to the point that the ROTC 4-year scholarships offer such an open and complete opportunity for our women that having that available, thinking of the example that the Academy sets, thinking of this as the touchstone, I would prefer to keep it that way.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Thank you very much, sir.

General Knowlton, one question of you, sir.

How is the mission statement of the Military Academy worded? Does it include "combat" wording?

General KNOWLTON. Just a moment, sir. I have the wording of that here.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. You can just provide it for the record.

General KNOWLTON. No sir, I think it's in the report, sir. I have it right here.

The mission you will find in our catalog is the general mission and a short one, written to inform the young men who are interested in coming to West Point, which reads as follows:

> To instruct and train the Corps of Cadets so that each graduate will have the qualities and attributes essential to his progressive and continuing development throughout a career as an officer of the Regular Army.

From that mission we derive four objectives, which are agreed on between us and the Department of the Army, and these four objectives are as follows:

> A strong internalization of the concepts embodied in duty, honor and country,
>
> A well-established educational foundation upon which to grow and to meet the challenges within the continuum of his professional duties,
>
> The physical conditioning to accomplish his duties and sustain him in a combat role, and
>
> A broad basic military education essential to combat leadership in the profession of arms.

In addition, I might state that from the moment the young man comes in there is an emphasis in everything we do on combat leadership in ground combat, and the young man has only to look at where the graduates are assigned to see that emphasis carried out.

I had some figures here, which I think——

Mr. DAN DANIEL [interrupting]. Our time is so limited, General Knowlton, if you could just supply that for the record, please?

General KNOWLTON. Right, sir.

[Information furnished follows:]

> During the past 11 years (graduating classes 1964 through 1974 inclusive), 96 percent of all USMA graduates have been assigned to the combat and combat support arms. Of 8,889 USMA graduates on active duty as of 3 June 1974, 93% were serving in these arms.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Secretary, would you provide for the record whether or not a cost-effective study has been made with respect to this proposal, and, if so, what it would be?

Secretary CALLAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The information to be provided is as follows:]

> The Army has not made a cost effective study with respect to the proposal of Admittance of Women to the United States Military Academy.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hillis.

Mr. HILLIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I only have a couple of questions at this time.

I'm sorry I had to leave during part of the opening statements here.

I notice, Mr. Secretary, that you commented that women presently are attending the Army War College and that some of them are general officers.

If women are not able to go to combat, why do they attend the Army War College?

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Hillis, as I mentioned in the testimony, we, of course, are extremely proud of the role that women play in the Army. It's a very positive role. It's not one that we take reluctantly.

It's one that we aggressively pursue, the role of women in the Army, and the Army is better for it.

In addition to the combat arms in the Army there are, of course, a great many combat support services, services such as the Adjutant General, Finance, Quartermaster, Judge Advocate General, things of this kind. There are commands in those combat support services, commands in which an adequate knowledge of the Army is very helpful. They are commands which take the utmost of skill, take the utmost of leadership qualities to command, and we have women in those commands who are doing extermely well. This has been our experience. They're doing extremely well, and we're extremely proud of them, and we think all Army education can be extremely helpful, and for that reason there are women who go to the school and we find that to be very helpful, but, Mr. Hillis, in different kinds of command from an actual combat command out in the ground combat environment of active combat. We think that the best solution is to have our women serving in the Army in everything except combat, in every other way to treat them precisely as equals, the same educational opportunities, the same leadership opportunities, the same promotional opportunities, as a man. As a matter of fact, we take great pride in the fact that, while many people speak it, we really believe that a woman has equal opportunities with a man, with the exception of combat, and we've spoken enough about that.

But we feel very strongly that a combat environment is not a place in today's world for a woman.

Mr. HILLIS. I have one more question.

In view of your statement, Mr. Secretary, you do not feel it would be better to prepare the women for these important noncombat command responsibilities if they had a Military Academy education available to them?

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Hillis, I do not deny that an Academy education would not be of additional benefit. I don't deny that. I think an Academy education would be of benefit to every single officer we've got. I think that for every ROTC graduate and every OCS graduate certainly some benefit would be gained from West Point. I don't deny that.

On the other hand, we have a limited number of spaces. I think, in utilizing those limited number of spaces for combat officers and, by doing that, having the kind of education at West Point that is in a Spartan atmosphere, a total immersion, 24 hours a day, 12 months a year, has produced the kind of officer that's effective in combat. I don't think that would be possible within a changed environment, such as that environment that many envision if we take women into West Point.

Mr. HILLIS. Thank you very much.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Weyand, in your statement you said, "As long as it is the desire of the people of this country, expressed through the Congress, that women not be employed in a combat role * * *," this does not apply to the Army does it?

It's my understanding that the congressional restriction against women in combat applies only to the Air Force and the Navy and the Marine Corps, and that the Army restriction is based upon a regulation of the Army rather than by law. Isn't this true?

General **Weyand**. I really don't know, sir.

General **Knowlton**. Yes; that's true.

General **Weyand**. There is no law; that's right.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. In other words, if you were so inclined at West Point, you could allow women in the Academy regardless of the law that now exists which prevents combat activities by women in the Navy and the Air Force?

Secretary **Callaway**. Mr. Wilson, let me say that we will be glad to provide a precise answer for the record.

My general feeling, from the attorneys that I've talked to, is that there is a great deal of confusion in that area. While there is no precise law that says clearly, "You shall not admit women to West Point," there are many references throughout the law to male terms, such as "sons of members," and things of that kind. There is some question whether the legislative history, with these references to male terms, and the clear understanding of the Congress from many years that we have excluded females, would legally preclude us from admitting females.

[Additional information follows:]

Analysis of Federal laws regarding women in combat roles and admission to West Point: See Sec. III, pp. 11-21, Government Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed in *Edwards, et al.* v. *Schlesinger, et al.*, Civil Action No. 1825-73, U.S.D.C., D.D.C. The Government's view of the statutory scheme was accepted by the District Court in its opinion of 19 June 1974. (The District Court's Order was appealed to the U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia.)

EXTRACT

GOVERNMENT MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES FILED IN *EDWARDS, ET AL.* V. *SCHLESINGER, ET AL.*, CIVIL ACTION NO. 1825-73, U.S.D.C., D.D.C. (SEC III, PP 11-21)

III

Admission of Women to the Service Academies Is Proscribed by the Pertinent Statutes. Plaintiffs Have Failed To State a Claim Upon Which Relief May Be Granted by Failing To Attack the Present Statutes

Defendants' refusal to admit women to the Service Academies is both consistent with and, more importantly, compelled by the statutes establishing the Academies. Although there are no express provisions for the exclusion of females from admission to the Academies, it is implicit in the language of the statutes and explicit from the legislative history and intent of Congress that such a legislative exclusion exists.

THE PLAIN LANGUAGE OF THE STATUTES

The statues establishing the Air Force Academy (Chapter 903 of Title 10, United States Code) contain over forty references to "cadets", almost thirty uses of male pronouns in referring to cadets, and seven express references to "sons". The statutes establishing the Naval Academy (Chapter 603 of Title 10, United States Code) similarly refer to "midshipmen" and "sons".* The same is

---

*Indeed, the Act of June 3, 1954, is particularly noteworthy in its providing for the appointment of only *sons* of certain "members of the land or naval forces (including *male* and *female* members . . .)." C. 251, § 1, 68 Stat. 168 (1954) (Emphasis added).

true for the statutes establishing the Military Academy (Chapter 403 of Title 10, United States Code). None of the statutes contain any references to "daughters", nor are female pronouns used.

With respect to those provisions requiring the appointment of "sons" of certain classes of persons, the natural construction would be to limit appointments to males. Unless there is some independent reason to construe "sons" to include "daughters", the natural construction should prevail. Had Congress desired to include females, it very easily could have used a word of neutral gender, such as "children" or "offspring".

If those provisions are limited to males, it would be unreasonable to construe the apparently sexually neutral provisions—those speaking of "cadets"—as allowing the apppointment of women. For one thing, the term "cadet" itself originally had masculine connotations. *See, e.g.*, BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 254 (4th ed. 1951). That the tenor of the times has changed does not affect the legislative purpose at the time of enactment. For another, there is no apparent rational explanation for Congress requiring certain appointees to be male (in these categories in which "sons" is specified) and to allow others to be of either gender. Certainly the categorization itself does not explain such a differentiation. Such an interpretation could be so arbitrary as to require constitutional scrutiny. A far more plausible explanation is that Congress assumed that all cadets at the Academies would be, as they have always been, male.

Section 1 of Title 1, United States Code, does not require a contrary conclusion. That section, enacted by Congress as an aid to statutory construction, provides in relevant part, "[U]nless the context indicates otherwise—. . . words importing the masculine gender include the feminine as well . . . ." However, the issue to be decided is whether "the context indicates otherwise", and that requires examination of certain other factors.*

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The Military Academy was established at West Point in 1802. The Naval Academy was established at Annapolis in 1845.** The direct statutory antecedents of today's statutes are well over 100 years old. For example, the basic statutory design for the Naval Academy as it exists today was complete by 1870. See Revised Statutes of the United States, §§ 1511-1528 (1875). At that time, Congress had not authorized the service of women in the permanent armed forces, let alone as midshipmen at the Naval Academy. Thus the employment of an expressly "male-only" limitation in the Academy provisions was unnecessary. So, for example, the Act of June 14, 1862 (Rev. Stat. § 1517 (1875)) provided, in part:

> "Candidates allowed for congressional district, for Territories, and for the District of Columbia must be actual residents of the districts or Territories, respectively, from which they are nominated. And all candidates must, at the time of their examination for admission, be between the ages of fourteen and eighteen years, and physically sound, well formed, and of robust constitution."

The lack of an express "male-only" limitation was not historically uncommon in other military statutes prior to the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, probably because of an unexpressed Congressional assumption that military statutes carried that obvious, male-only restriction. Thus, for example, when Congress provided for Regular enlistments in the Navy in 1912 (37 Stat. 356) and the Army in 1916 (37 Stat. 185-86), it did not expressly limit enlistments to "male citizens", yet it was never seriously argued that women could be enlisted and indeed because the contrary was true, the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 was passed (62 Stat. 356). It might generally be said, then, that because of the well-established historical legislative limitations on the service of women in the armed forces generally, terms of gender in military statutes ordinarily ought to be read literally.

---

*Plaintiffs must argue in this case, if they are to avoid the statutes here involved, that when Congress said "sons' Congress really meant "sons *and* daughters." Not to argue so—yet to contend that Congress authorized the appointment of women to the Academy—would be to create a mandatory preference for male children which is not supported by any legislative history whatsoever, and which raises patent equal protection questions.

**The Air Force Academy, a relative new-comer, was not established until 1954.

The Women's Armed Services Integration Act made no express reference to or change of the statutes relating to the Service Academies. Indeed, the floor debates on the Integration Act demonstrated implicitly the *absence* of any change in Academy enabling provisions:

> [Mr. Bryson, commenting on the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948:]
>
> ". . . [Y]ou can put it down as a fact that the women have now made a permanent place for themselves in our military services. Congressman E. E. Cox, of Georgia, has even proposed a joint military academy to train young women as officers in the various services—a West Point for women." (Defendants' Exhibit 6).

The Cox proposal apparently met with no success and, as such, was not the first or last unsuccessful proposal for either a women's academy or admission of women to the Service Academies. As early as 1945, Congress had before it a bill to create a Women's Naval Academy, H.R. 3402.* At that time, there was never a hint that such a bill would be "unnecessary"—on the ground, for instance, that women already could be admitted to the Academies. The legislative history of the 1948 Integration Act contains no reference to admission to the Service Academies. On the contrary, there was testimony p[illegible]ly delineating training avenues for women quite apart from attendance at [illegible] military service academies. For example, the Army planned for a special Women's Army Corps training center while the Navy's plans seem to have included training of women only at Great Lakes. *See* Hearings before the Senate Committee on Armed Services on S. 1527, S. Doc. No. 1641, 80th Cong., 1st Sess., 53, 64 (1947). If Congress had, by the integration Act, intended to authorize the admission of women to the Naval Academy, it seems likely that the military services would have commented, to some degree, on such a significant change as, for example, the Navy had done in 1945 when confronted with an analogous situation. See Defendants' Exhibit 5. There is neither evidence of change nor comment thereon.

What history there is on the question of whether the Integration Act altered the male-only admission restriction unambiguously points in the direction of *no* such alteration. The "West Point for Women" which Congressman Cox had proposed at the time of the Integration Act and upon which Congressman Bryson, a most ardent supporter of the Integration Act of 1948, had commented (see Defendants' Exhibit 6) would obviously have been unnecessary if Congress, by the Integration Act, had intended to make nomination, selection, and appointment to the Service Academies available to women. *See* 94 Cong. Rec., Pt. 4, 80th Cong., 2d Sess. 4717.

Since 1948, Congress has amended the statutes governing the Academies on several occasions and never gave any indication of changing the pre-1948 statutory requirement** that only males be admitted. On the contrary, Congress has perpetuated the statutes' male-only terminology with amendments (including the term "sons") as recently as 1972. *E.g.*, Act of August 7, 1972, Pub. L. 92-365, 86 Stat. 505; Act of October 13, 1966, Pub. L. 89-650, 80 Stat. 896; Act of June 3, 1954, c. 251, 68 Stat. 168. Moreover, in 1964 Congress took affirmative action to remove the male-only limitations on other officer candidate procurement programs without alteration of the Academy provisions. 10 U.S.C. §§ 2101-2111, Act of October 13, 1964, Pub. L., 88-647, § 201, 78 Stat. 1064 (1964).

The legislative history of the Air Force Academy Act contains valuable insight. There are several references to the concept of the Academy as a source of young male officers. For example, in discussing the need for such a bill as the one authorizing the creation of an Air Force Academy, the history states:

> ". . . The Academy will insure the Air Force a constant source of trained officers, since only men who are motivated to a lifetime career as Air Force officers will presumably enter the Air Force Academy." 1954 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News p. 2108.

In its sectional analysis of the bill, the history indicates:

> ". . . Studies made by the Air Force indicates that only about 50 out of each 1,000 of the young male population of the United States at large could be expected to pass of the examinations necessary to qualify as an Air Force cadet. . . ." Id. at 2114.

---

* A report on H.R. 3402 is attached as Defendants' Exhibit 5.

*It is clear that prior to 1948 and the authorization of the permanent enlistment and appointment of women into the armed forces the admission of women to the Academies was not authorized. If for no other reason, it would be nonsense to argue that Congress would have authorized the education and training of women for commissions they could never, by law, accept.

Under the heading of "Examining Facilities", the history states:

> ". . . The Air Force plans to establish approximately 32 examining stations in existing Air Force installations for the purpose of examining young men who have been nominated to take the examination. . . ." Ibid.

Surely, it is strained reasoning to conclude that the drafters had no predilections as to women in the Academy when every reference is to young men and no such references exist as to women. However, even the skeptics must be satisfied by an exchange which took place on the floor of the House of Representatives on January 20, 1954. In the debate of the bill authorizing the appropriation necessary for construction of the Academy, the following comments appear:

"Mr. Fulton. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. Short. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

"Mr. Fulton. May I compliment the gentleman on his speech? The Academy is certainly needed. May I ask the gentleman a question?

"Mr. Short. Yes.

"Mr. Fulton. I believe, if we are going to have each service represented with good officers, we should expand and probably have some sort of an academy for the women's services, so that they, too, may have the advantages that these men are getting. Why not have an academy for the WACS, the WAVES, and the WAAFS? That is a serious question.

"Mr. Short. Yes; that is not as ridiculous as it might sound at first. But I do not think we should mix it up with this particular academy.

"Mr. Fulton. Oh, I do not mean at this time.

"Mr. Short. No; it is something to which we should give attention and serious consideration.

"Mr. Fulton. If the gentleman will yield further, are any plans being made now for the women's services for a school of a similar type?

"Mr. Short. Not at this time. Right now, we need an academy for the Air Force, a coequal arm of our national defense, which is becoming increasingly important.

"Mr. Fulton. My point is this, if the gentleman will permit, Does not the gentleman think, as we have the women's services now as a permanent part of our national defense services, that we should have adequate training facilities for them, and some sort of a service school?

"Mr. Short. Certainly I cannot disagree with that; I think the gentleman is correct. We should have adequate training facilities. I am for the women always." 100 Cong. Rec. 534 (1954)

There can be no doubt that the sense of Congress at the time of passage of this bill was that women were not considered as eligible for admission to the Air Force Academy.

The military's historical interpretation of the statues to be "male-only" is well-known to the Congress since, after all, it is by congressional nomination that many appointments to the Academies are made. Over the course of many years the statutes have been amended in other respects without alteration in this regard. Moreover, Congress has annually appropriated funds for the Service Academies notwithstanding the present admission policies. Such action by Congress may be interpreted as congressional acquiescence in the present administrative construction.

OTHER FACTORS

Congress' reluctance to allow women in combat, combined with the fact that the primary role of the Service Academies is to train combat leaders, is a further indication that Congress never authorized admitting women to the Academies. For example, as late as just 10 years prior to the Women's Armed Services Integration Act, Congress continued to adopt expressly the view of the Naval Academy and the Academy's historical mission as the training avenue whereby "the officers of the Navy [become] well-fitted to train the fleet in time of peace and to lead it in time of war." *See* S. Doc. No. 181, 75th Cong., 3d Sess. 69–71 (1938). Regardless of the view employed today, in 1948 the Congress still visualized the Naval Academy as the training ground for the Navy's men of the line—the essence of the Naval fighting defense force. At the same time—1948—the Congress adopted the antecedent to 10 U.S.C. § 6015, the provision proscribing the assignment of women to aircraft engaged in combat or to combatant ships. Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, c. 449, § 210, 62 Stat. 368 (1948); *see* Hearings on S. 1641 before Subcommittee No. 3, Organization and Mobilization, of the House Committee on Armed Services, 80th Cong., 2d Sess. 5689, 5712–13 (1948).

It is hardly unreasonable to believe—and so to construe Chapter 603 of Title 10, United States Code—that Congress might not have provided for the training of women in functions and for duties that they could *never*, by law, perform and at an institution which Congress itself had viewed to be the professional training ground of the Navy, the product of which was to be the Naval officer to lead the fleet in time of war. *Cf.* Defendants' Exhibit 5.

The legislative debate on the equal rights amendment is also suggestive. With but few exceptions, *e.g.*, 117 Cong. Rec. H9252 (daily ed., Oct. 6, 1971) (remarks of Rep. Abzug), members of Congress were unwilling to allow women to serve in the front lines. Those in opposition to the amendment argued that Congress should reject it because, since it was absolute on its face, its passage would result in women being admitted to the Service Academies and being used in combat operations. *See, e.g.*, 117 Cong. Rec. H9382 (daily ed., Oct. 12, 1971) (remarks of Rep. Dorn), 117 Cong. Rec. S4253 (daily ed., Mar. 20, 1972) (remarks of Sen. Ervin); 117 Cong. Rec. S4610 (daily ed., Mar. 22, 1972) (remarks of Sen. Thurmond). Those in favor of the equal rights amendment argued that its passage would not require the use of women in combat. *E.g.*, 117 Cong. Rec. H9249 (daily ed., Oct. 6, 1971) ("ridiculous" to think of women in "front lines") (remarks of Rep. McClory). Thus, the sponsor of the amendment, Representative Martha Griffiths of Michigan, stated, "[O]nce you are in the Army you are put where the Army tells you where [sic] you are going to go. . . . [W]omen . . . will be the stenographers and telephone operators." 117 Cong. Rec. H9264 (daily ed., Oct. 12, 1971). Finally in this regard, commentators outside Congress principally relied upon by supporters of the amendment assert their belief that the amendment would require the integration of the Service Academies in the future, thereby implicitly suggesting that under present law the Academies are properly maintained as all-male institutions. Brown, Emerson, Falk, and Freedman. "The Equal Rights Amendment: A Constitutional Basis for Equal Rights for Women," 80 Yale L.J. 871, 969 (1971).

Perhaps the most significant recent action by Congress is the enactment in 1972 of Title IX of Public Law 92-318, 86 Stat. 373, 20 U.S.C. § 1681(a)(4), which creates an express exception for the Service Academies in a statute prohibiting sex discrimination in educational programs receiving federal funds. Section 1681 reads, in pertinent part:

> ". . . No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, except that:
>
> *   *   *   *   *   *   *
>
> ". . . This section shall not apply to an educational institution whose primary purpose is the training of individuals for the military services of the United States . . . ."

Finally, the actions of some members of Congress who have attempted since 1972 to have women admitted to the Service Academies is instructive. Some members have nominated women as cadets. *See, e.g.*, 117 Cong. Rec. S4860 (daily ed., Mar. 28, 1972) (remarks of Sen. Javits). These attempts have been unsuccessful. Consequently, some members of Congress have introduced legislation, initially in the form of concurrent resolutions (*E.g.*, S. Con.Res. 71, H.Con. Res. 578, 92d Cong., 2d Sess. (1972)) but later in the form of bills (*E.g.*, S. 2351, S.2352, H.R.9832, H.R.10705, H.R.11711, 93rd Cong., 1st Sess. (1973)), to require the admission of women to the Service Academies on substantially the same basis as men. The very introduction of these bills that underscores the defendants' contention that the present statutes preclude the admission of women. Unless one wishes to attribute to these Congressmen and Senators meaningless acts, there can be only one reason for the introduction of such legislation, i.e., to remove the statutory restriction presently in existence. Moreover, although the legislative inaction on all these bills need not always imply congressional opposition to the action proposed, at least one explanation usually available for legislative inaction—uncertainty as to administrative interpretation of present law—is not available in this case.

Appended to our motion and marked as Defendants' Exhibit 7 is a letter from the Honorable F. Edward Hébert, Chairman, U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Armed Services, to Mr. Roger T. Kelley, then Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs). Mr. Hébert concluded:

> ". . . I submit that the total context of the applicable statutes clearly indicates that only men are eligible for appointment to the academies and if any other course is planned, then the Executive Branch must come to the Congress for legislative authority. . . ."

Defendants respectfully contend that all indices support its position that the relief requested by plaintiffs in this suit is precluded by the applicable statutes and therefore no duty as set out in the complaint can be owed to plaintiffs while those statutes remain in their present form.

Since plaintiffs have failed to attack the statutes themselves and have not sought to convene a three-judge court, they have failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Civil Action No. 1825-73
Civil Action No. 1826-73

DON EDWARDS, ET AL., Plaintiffs, *v.* JAMES R. SCHLESINGER, ET AL., Defendants.

JEROME WALDIE, ET AL., Plaintiffs, *v.* JAMES R. SCHLESINGER, ET AL., Defendants.

OPINION

This matter came before the Court upon defendants' motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary judgment. Plaintiffs cross-moved for partial summary judgment. Also pending before the Court is plaintiff's motion for certification of the class which plaintiffs seek to represent. In order to set the background for a discussion of the issues raised by these motions, a chronological development of the suit is set forth below.

I.

Plaintiffs filed these two actions on September 26, 1973, seeking declaratory relief, an injunction and damages against the United States Air Force Academy (C.A. No. 1825-73) and the United States Naval Academy (C.A. No. 1826-73) for their alleged unconstitutional failure to consider women for appointment to those service academies. Extensive discovery followed.

On March 11, 1974, plaintiffs filed a motion, pursuant to local rule 1-13(b), to certify the class. On April 29, 1974, the defendants moved to dismiss the complaints, or, in the alternative, for summary judgment. At the same time, defendants also moved to consolidate the two actions. Plaintiffs cross-moved for summary judgment May 15, 1974, and a hearing was held June 4, 1974, at which time the motions were taken under advisement. On June 14, 1974, plaintiffs moved for a temporary restraining order, and a hearing was held that same day. By order dated June 14, the Court denied the request for a temporary restraining order, for reasons set forth therein. At the same time, the Court ruled on defendants' motion for consolidation, granting the same insofar as the Naval and Air Force Academies were concerned.[1]

The facts as presented by the various motions and oral arguments are as follows: Plaintiffs in each case are two Congressmen who have nominated female applicants for the respective academy. Also named as party plaintiff in each case is one female nominee. Plaintiffs allege that those individuals nominated who are female are routinely refused consideration for appointment to the Academy, to the detriment of their rights under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

There is no doubt that neither the Air Force Academy for the Naval Academy will consider a female nominee. Air Force regulations provide that an "[a]pplicant must be a male citizen of the United States."[2] Likewise, Navy regulations indicate that "candidates for admission to the U.S. Naval Academy must be male citizens of the United States."[3] In light of the fact that selections to the Academies are made during the spring of each year, the parties agreed that five positions at each Academy should be held pending the outcome of this lawsuit or until June 18, 1974, whichever came earlier.[4]

Because oral argument could not be held until June 4, 1974, and the case having been taken under advisement at that time, plaintiffs moved for a temporary restraining order June 14, asking this Court to extend for 10 days the period open for possible appointment of women. The Court, finding no irreparable injury or probability of success on the merits, denied that motion.[5]

---

[1] Prior to consolidation, of course, plaintiffs filed parallel papers in each of the two cases. The discussion herein will apply to both Academies, except where noted; for ease of reference, filings in C.A. No. 1825-73 will be referred to as *Edwards* and filings in C.A. No. 1826-73 will be referred to as *Waldie*.

[2] 32 C.F.R. § 901.5.

[3] 32 C.F.R. § 710.12.

[4] See letter of April 5, 1974, from Earl J. Silbert to Thomas S. Martin, attached to plaintiffs motion for a temporary restraining order dated June 14, 1974.

The fundamental question raised by this lawsuit is whether or not plaintiffs suffer a deprivation of constitutional rights through the policy of the Air Force and Naval Academies. As will be seen below, this question is not susceptible to a simple solution. Before discussing this issue, however, the motion to certify the class will be dealt with.

II.

Plaintiffs seek to maintain these suits as class actions, on behalf of "all past, present, and future female applicants to the U.S. Air Force [and Naval] Academy who have been, are being, and will be denied admission by the discretionary practices complained of herein."[6] The class is of the type described by Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2):

> the party opposing the class has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the class as a whole; . . . .

At the outset, it should be noted that plaintiffs' motion is untimely. Local rule 1-13(b) provides that "[w]ithin 90 days after the filing of a complaint . . . plaintiff shall move for a certification under Rule [Fed. R. Civ. P.] 23(c)(1) . . . ." The complaints in these cases were filed September 26, 1973, but the motions to certify the class were not filed until March 11, 1974.

Proceeding to the merits of certifying the class, it can be seen that the group of people sought to be included is ill-defined, particularly with respect to those "future" members of the class. Notice, a desirable, although not required, element, would be impossible.[7]

This Court adheres to the view that where injunctive and declaratory relief is requested, such relief, where appropriate, can be fashioned to run to the benefit of those sought to be included in the class.[8] In light of this, no compelling reason is presented to complicate the lawsuit by certification of the class, and the speedy resolution of the issues presented here would be aided by proceeding with the named plaintiffs only.

III.

The preliminary question which must be resolved in order to deal with the merits of this case is what standard should be applied to the Air Force and Naval Academies' refusal to consider women for admission to those institutions. The choice, of course, is between the "rational relation to a legitimate governmental interest" test,[9] and, in the case of a "suspect classification," the "compelling state interest" test.[10] The difference in stringency between the two tests is significant. Plaintiffs have pressed strenuously upon the Court an argument that the latter test should be applied; for reasons set forth below, it is the Court's conclusion that the "rational relationship" test should be applied.

In *Reed v. Reed*, 404 U.S. 71 (1971), the Supreme Court considered the constitutionality of the Idaho probate code, which provided that within the various classes of persons eligible to administer a decedent's estate, "males must be preferred to females. . . ."[11] Idaho justified the statute on the grounds that the automatic preference of males reduced the workload of the probate courts by eliminating one area of contest in the course of probate.[12] The Court measured this objective by asking "whether a difference in the sex of competing applicants for letters of administration bears a rational relationship to [the] state objective that is sought to be advanced by . . . § 15-314."[13] Applying this test, the Court concluded that reducing the courts' workload by eliminating equal consideration of females with males for letters of administration was not "consistent with the command of the Equal Protection Clause." [14]

---

[5] See Order of June 14, 1974.

[6] *Edwards* complaint at 3-4; *Waldie* complaint at 3-4.

[7] Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c) requires notice only where a (b)(3) class is concerned. Some courts, including this one, have found that due process can require that a (b)(1) or (b)(2) class receive notice also. *Arey v. Providence Hospital*, 55 F.R.D. 62, 70 (D.D.C. 1972).

[8] *Kinsey v. Legg, Mason & Company, Inc.*, 60 F.R.D. 91, 100-101 (D.D.C. 1973); *National Welfare Rights Organization v. Dept. of HEW*, CA 264-73 (D.D.C. Oct. 16, 1973), slip op. at 9. In *Bridgeport Guardians, Inc. v. Members of Bridgeport Civil Service Comm'n*, 354 F. Supp. 778 (D. Conn. 1973), the court found that as "any equitable relief to which plaintiffs may be entitled would benefit all persons similarly situated, there is no compelling reason to designate a class." 354 F. Supp. at 783.

[9] *See Jefferson v. Hackney*, 406 U.S. 535, 546 (1972); *Richardson v. Belcher*, 404 U.S. 78, 81 (1971); *Dandridge v. Williams*, 397 U.S. 471, 485 (1970); *McGowan v. Maryland*, 366 U.S. 420, 426 (1961); *Fleming v. Nestor*, 363 U.S. 603, 611 (1960).

[10] *See Graham v. Richardson*, 403 U.S. 365, 372 (1971); *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1, 11 (1967); *Oyama v. California*, 332 U.S. 633, 644-46 (1948).

[11] 15 Idaho Code § 314.

[12] 404 U.S. at 76.

[13] Id.

The importance of *Reed* becomes apparent when one reads *Frontiero v. Richardson*, 411 U.S. 677 (1973). *Frontiero* involved a challenge to the constitutionality of four statutes [15] which provided that wives of male members of the armed forces were to be automatically considered dependents for the purposes of increased housing allowances and medical and dental benefits, but in the case of husbands of female members, they were to be so considered only if the servicewoman was able to prove that her husband was dependent upon her for more than one-half of his support.

Justice Brennan, with three Justices concurring, concluded that sex should join race,[16] alienage,[17] and national origin [18] as an inherently suspect classification, thus imposing "strict judicial scrutiny" upon any sex-based classification.[19] In so concluding, the plurality opinion found "at least implicit support for such an approach in our unanimous decision . . . in *Reed v. Reed*. . . ." [20] This implicit support stemmed from the following language in *Reed*:

> To give a mandatory preference to members of either sex over members of the other, merely to accomplish the elimination of hearings on the merits, is to make the very kind of arbitrary legislative choice forbidden by the Equal Protection Clause. . . .[21]

Justice Brennan felt that this represented a "departure from 'traditional' rationale basis analysis. . . ." [22] Relying on this, the plurality opinion concluded that "any statutory scheme which draws a sharp line between the sexes, *solely* for the purpose of achieving administrative convenience . . . involves the 'very kind of arbitrary legislative choice forbidden by the [Constitution]. . . .' *Reed v. Reed*. . . ." [23]

Justice Stewart concurred in the result, "agreeing that the statutes before us work on invidious discrimination in violation of the Constitution," [24] relying on *Reed*. Also placing reliance on *Reed* was Justice Powell, who was joined in his concurring opinion by the Chief Justice and Justice Blackmun. Justice Powell argued vigorously that "[i]t is unnecessary for the Court in this case to characterize sex as a suspect classification, with all of the far-reaching implications of such a holding."[25] The Court, said Justice Powell, "can and should decide this case on the authority of Reed and reserve for the future any expansion of its rationale." [26]

Thus, sex was not clearly made an inherently suspect classification, as only four members of the Court were willing to apply strict judicial scrutiny to such classifications. Four members clearly were not.[27] Plaintiffs argue that the correct interpretation of *Frontiero* is that classifications based on sex should be examined as Justice Brennan suggests, with strict judicial scrutiny;[28] defendants argue that the rational relationship test explicitly applied in *Reed* should govern. In order to resolve this, review of a more recent sex discrimination case is helpful.

---

[14] Id.

[15] 37 U.S.C. §§ 401, 403; 10 U.S.C. §§ 1072, 1076.

[16] *Loving* v. *Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1, 11 (1967).

[17] *Graham* v. *Richardson*, 403 U.S. 365, 372 (1971).

[18] *Oyama* v. *California*, 332 U.S. 633, 644–46 (1948).

[19] 411 U.S. at 682–88.

[20] Id. at 682.

[21] 404 U.S. at 76.

[22] 411 U.S. at 684.

[23] Id. at 690.

[24] *Id.* at 691. It should be noted that "invidious discrimination" has elsewhere been applied in the context of a "rational relation" or "reasonable relation" test. *Lehnhausen* v. *Lake Shore Auto Parts Co.*, 410 U.S. 356, 359 (1973).

[25] 411 U.S. at 691–92. The concurring opinion went on to argue that because the Equal Rights Amendment is currently in the process of being ratified by the states, "reaching out to pre-empt by judicial action a major political decision . . . does not reflect appropriate respect for duly prescribed legislative processes." *Id.* at 692.

[26] *Id.*

[27] Justice Rehnquist dissented. *Id.* at 691.

[28] This contention was apparently rejected in *United States v. Offord*, 42 U.S.L.W. 2485 (E.D. Wisc. March 7, 1974). Suit was brought seeking to declare the Selective Service laws unconstitutional as an impermissible discrimination based on sex. The court indicated that the plurality opinion of *Frontiero* did not make clear whether or not sex is now a suspect classification.

In any event, the court there found that the statutes involve a "governmental interest [that] is so extremely urgent that courts must show the greatest deference to congressional judgment." 42 U.S.L.W. at 2485. The *Offord* court, of course, was without the benefit of *Kahn v. Shevin*, 42 U.S.L.W. 4591 (U.S. April 24, 1974).

In *Kahn* v. *Shevin*, 42 U.S.L.W. 4591 (U.S. April 24, 1974), the Supreme Court found valid a Florida statute which provided a $500 annual property tax exemption for widows. The statute had been attacked by petitioner, a widower, on the grounds that there was no analogous benefit for widowers. Justice Douglas, speaking for the majority,[29] found that, unlike *Forntiero*, where the sole ground for the sex-based classification was administrative convenience, Kahn involved "a state tax law reasonably designed to further the state policy of cushioning the financial impact of spousal loss upon the sex for whom that loss imposes a disproportionately heavy burden."[30]

No intimation of a strict judicial standard is present in *Kahn*. In fact, the Court went on to note that another tax case, *Allied Stores v. Bowers*, 358 U.S. 522 (1959), provided that a statute that "may discriminate in favor of a certain class [is not] arbitrary if the discrimination is founded upon a *reasonable* distinction or difference in state policy."[31] In fact, when discussing the dissents, the majority opinion did not even come to grips with Justice Brennan's continuing assertion that gender-based classifications, "like classifications based upon race, alienage, and national origin, must be subjected to close judicial scrutiny. . . ."[32]

Joined by Justice Marshall, Justice Brennan again urged upon the Court that sex is a suspect classification, concluding, however, that the Florida statute could serve a compelling governmental interest if more narrowly drafted.[33] In a separate dissent, Justice White concluded that "gender-based classifications are suspect"[34] and that Florida had not made a sufficient showing to justify continuing the distinction.

It may be argued that *Kahn* should not be given a general interpretation, but rather should be limited to the field of taxation, based upon the majority opinion's reference to Lehnhausen v. Lake Shore Auto Parts Co., 410 U.S. 356 (1973), where the Court said that "[w]here taxation is concerned and no specific federal right, apart from equal protection, is imperiled, the States have large leeway in making classifications . . . ."[35] The Court does not consider this narrowing argument controlling. Reference to Lehnhausen shows that that quotation is not in the context of tax cases alone.[36]

The conclusion to be drawn from Kahn is that the Supreme Court has not declared sex to be an inherently suspect classification. Indeed, *Kahn* seems to indicate that only three Justices currently share this view. Therefore, the rational relationship test is the one properly to be applied to the matters before the Court.[37]

---

[29] Justice Douglas was joined by the Chief Justice and Justices Stewart, Blackmun, Powell and Rehnquist.

[30] 42 U.S.L.W. at 4592. In support of this conclusion, the Court relied upon data showing that median earnings among women and the percentage of women working full-time are substantially below similar figures for men. *Id.*, nn. 4-7.

[31] 358 U.S. at 528 (emphasis added).

[32] 42 U.S.L.W. at 4593 (footnotes omitted).

[33] *Id.* at 4593–94.

[34] *Id.* at 4594.

[35] 410 U.S. at 359 (footnote omitted). *See* 42 U.S.L.W. at 4592–93.

[36] 410 U.S. at 359.

[37] This appears to be the view of at least one other District Court." In *White v. Flemming*, 42 U.S.L.W. 2615 (E.D. Wisc. May 7, 1974), Chief Judge Reynolds of the Eastern District of Wisconsin applied the "rational relationship to a legitimate state objective" test while considering whether a city ordinance prohibiting female tavern employees from sitting with male patrons invidiously discriminated against women. The court, clearly applying the standard of rationality, found that the ordinance had not advanced in a reasonable manner any legitimate legislative objective.

The Court notices that at least two District Courts have followed Justice Brennan in applying strict judicial scrutiny to sex classifications. *See Ballard v. Laird*, 360 F. Supp. 643, 647 (S.D. Cal. 1973), and *Wiesenfeld v. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare*, 367 F. Supp. 981, 990 (D. N.J. 1973). Both of these decisions preceded *Kahn*, *White v. Flemming*, noted above, was subsequent to *Kahn*.

In *Wiesenfeld*, a three-judge court was convened to consider whether the provision for payment of "mother's insurance benefits" by the Social Security Administration unconstitutionally discriminated against a father whose wife had died in childbirth. The court applied strict judicial scrutiny, determining that 42 U.S.C. § 402(g) discriminated against women who gained employment as well as men and children who had lost their wives and mothers. The court determined that § 402(g) could pass the "traditional" equal protection standard of rationality, but failed when measured by "strict judicial scrutiny."

The court applied Justice Brennan's standard despite the fact that earlier discussion of the current controlling standard had concluded that

> [w]hile a decision by a divided Court is as final on all issues of the cases as a decision by a unanimous court the reasoning employed by a plurality does not become law. *Frontiero* demonstrates that a majority of the Supreme Court has not yet classified sex as "inherently suspect." 367 F. Supp. at 988 (footnote omitted).

The court further rejected the suggestion put forth by some that *Frontiero* and *Reed* have created a sort of "intermediate test" for cases of discrimination on sex:

> In *Reed* and *Frontiero* we do not discern a "general shift" of standards nor the establishment of a "new intermediate" equal protection test, and we reject those cases which adopt such standards. *Id.*

The court concluded that "we cannot be absolutely certain how statutory sex discrimination fits within equal protection doctrine." *Id.* In the nillieu of this uncertainty, the court determined to apply Justice Brennan's strict standard.

As noted above, the learned discussion of Judge Fisher preceded the Supreme Court decision in *Kahn v. Shevin*. In light of that case, as the text of the present Opinion points out, the current state of the law is such that the *Frontiero* standard should not be applied.

IV.

Although no statute specifically bars women from any service academy, defendants urge that those statutes relating to the Air Force and Naval Academies always use the masculine pronoun, and, when read with legislative history, indicate Congress has always intended that only men be admitted. The Court is mindful of 1 U.S.C. § 1, which prohibits the practice of excluding the female gender from statutory language using male pronouns only, except where "the context indicates otherwise." Nothing in the contexts of 10 U.S.C. §§ 6958or 9346 indicate that males only must be considered.[38]

The defendants do, however, make a convincing argument that the exclusion of women from the Academies is rationally related to a legitimate governmental interest when 10 U.S.C. §§ 6015 and 8549 are considered. Those statutes provide:

> . . . However, women may not be assigned to duty in aircraft that are engaged in combat missions nor may they be assigned to duty on vessels of the Navy other than hospital ships and transports. 10 U.S.C. § 6015.
>
> Female members of the Air Force . . . may not be assigned to duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions. 10 U.S.C. § 8549.

Deputy Secretary of Defense William Clements has stated that "[t]he primary function of the three Service Academies is, and always has been to train military officers for combat duty." [39]

In the case of the Air Force Academy, the Superintendent, Lt. Gen. A. P. Clark, has said that "[t]his institution is primarily dedicated to the production of combat leadership for the future Air Force." [40] Much has been made by plaintiffs of the fact that an average of 17 percent of the cadets admitted to the Academy are not physically qualified to go on to flight school.[41] While this appears to be the case, Lt. Gen. Clark's references to the combat role of Academy graduates is persuasive:

> At least 70% of Academy Graduates go on to flying schools. All Air Force air crews are eligible for combat assignments. Special problems are created for prospective female candidates in view of the law which prohibits women from serving as crew members on aircraft destined for combat. The balance of the class membership, many of whom are not accepted for flying training as a result of physical disqualifications, nevertheless receive the full spectrum of military training offered by the Academy. A portion of this group will become missile control officers, a combat related assignment not presently open to females as a matter of policy. The remaining Academy graduates may never fly or navigate a war plane into the combat arena or launch a missile against an enemy target, but each is fully qualified to lead men in any other combat situation into which they may find themselves thrust as a consequence of the role they must assume as military leaders.[42]

As a matter of law and policy, women in the United States armed forces are not assigned to active combat roles. Since it is the purpose of the Air Force Academy to train officers for combat, limiting admissions to men at that institution is related to fulfillment of that goal.

In the case of the Naval Academy, Vice Admiral William P. Mack, Superintendent of that institution, has stated that:

> The mission of the Naval Academy is to prepare young men to be professional officers in the Navy or Marine Corps. For 125 years, the Academy has produced for the naval service the highest caliber unrestricted line officers, that is, officers trained for eventual command at sea or in combat arms. With the exception of the admission of certain foreign nations to the Academy, no person is appointed a midshipman at the Naval Academy who, at the

---

[38] Indeed, the only provisions that clearly exclude women from appointment are 10 U.S.C. §§ 6954(a)(1) and (8), 6954(b)(1), 6954(c), 9342(a)(1) and (8), 9342(b)(1), and 9342(c). These are all sections which use the word "sons rather than any male pronoun or noun subject to the interpretation of 1 U.S.C. § 1. No such word use is encountered, however, in 10 U.S.C. §§ 6958 and 9346, the sections which discuss qualifications for admission. Indeed, at the request of the House Armed Services Committee, the Department of Defense determined that "[n]one of the statutes relating to any of the three service academies require a person to be male in order to be eligible for nomination or appointment to the academies." *Hearings on Cost Escalation in Defense Procurement Contracts and Military Postures and H.R. 6722 before the House Committee on Armed Services*, 93rd Cong., 1st Sess., pt. 3 at 2307 (1973).

[39] Affidavit of William Clements, April 23, 1974, at 2, attached as Exhibit 1 to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss of April 29, 1974 [hereinafter cited as Clements Affidavit].

[40] Affidavit of Lt. Gen. A. P. Clark, April 19, 1974, at 2, attached as Exhibit 3 to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss of April 29, 1974 [hereinafter cited as Clark Affidavit].

[41] See Brief in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment at 41. The physical disqualification in these instances is eyesight.

[42] Clark Affidavit at 3.

> time of appointment, cannot in due course qualify for commission as an officer of the unrestricted line in the Navy or Marine Corps.[43]

Because all midshipmen admitted to the Academy are expected to serve as line officers on combat vessels, the proscription of 10 U.S.C. § 6015 would mean that women simply could not fulfill the role of an Annapolis graduate and also comply with the requirements of that statute. No attack has been made on the constitutionality of that statute or 10 U.S.C. § 8549, thus showing that the government can rationally relate its policy of limiting admissions to men at the Naval Academy to the legitimate governmental interest of preparing an adequate number of unrestricted line officers for duty at sea.

In the case of the Naval Academy, admission of women would necessarily mean a decrease in the number of male graduates who would be expected to serve on combat vessels, because the Academy is limited in its enrollment. It can readily be seen that admission of women would be detrimental to the maintenance of an adequate officer complement for sea duty.[44]

V.

Approaching the question from yet another standpoint, it is clear that the *Reed*, and *Frontiero* decisions were concerned with classifications based on sex with no justification other than ease of administration. In *Reed*, the Court noted that "[c]learly the objective of reducing the workload on probate courts by eliminating one class of contests is not without some legitimacy. The crucial question, however, is whether [the statute] advances that objective in a manner consistent with the command of the Equal Protection Clause. We hold that it does not."[45] In *Frontiero*, Justice Brennan said that "any statutory scheme which draws a sharp line between the sexes, *solely* for the purpose of achieving administrative convenience, necessarily . . . involves the 'very kind of arbitrary legislative choice forbidden by the [Constitution] . . . .' "[46] Finally, in *Kahn*, this same language was repeated by Justice Brennan in dissent, while the majority said: "This is not a case like *Frontiero* v. *Richardson*, 411 U.S. 677, where the Government denied its female employees both substantive and procedural benefits granted males '*solely* for administrative convenience.' "[47]

The government has clearly demonstrated that far more than administrative convenience is involved in the policy to admit only men to the Air Force and Naval Academies. As did the Supreme Court in *Kahn*, this Court concludes that the admissions policy of the Navy and Air Force Academies is reasonably related to furthering a legitimate governmental interest—the preparation of young men to assume leadership roles in combat where necessary to the defense of the nation.[48]

Judge.

Date: June 19, 1974.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Civil Action No. 1825–73

Civil Action No. 1826–73

DON EDWARDS, ET AL., Plaintiffs, *v.* JAMES R. SCHLESINGER, ET AL., Defendants.

JEROME WALDIE, ET AL., Plaintiffs, *v.* JAMES R. SCHLESINGER, ET AL., Defendants.

ORDER

This matter came before the Court upon defendants' motion to dismiss, or, in the alternative, for summary judgment and plaintiffs' cross-motion for partial summary judgment. The views of the Court having been stated in the foregoing Opinion, it is by the Court this 19th day of June, 1974,

---

[43] Affidavit of Vice Admiral William P. Mack, April 22, 1974, at 2, attached as Exhibit 2 to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss of April 29, 1974 [hereinafter cited as Mack Affidavit].

[44] Mack Affidavit at 7. The same would be true of the Air Force Academy, of course, as there too the total enrollment is limited.

[45] 404 U.S. at 76.

[46] 411 U.S. at 690, quoting from *Reed* v. *Reed*, 404 U.S. at 76 (emphasis in original).

[47] 42 U.S.L.W. at 4592 (emphasis in original).

[48] The Court notes that the result reached here does not mean that women are ineligible for educational programs leading to both a bachelor's degree and a military commission. Both the Air Force and the Navy have R.O.T.C. programs at many fully accredited four-year colleges and universities. As deputy Secretary of Defense Clements noted:

> The Reserve Officers Training Corps scholarship program has recently been opened to women. Through this program, young women may acquire their college education and military training at schools having coeducational facilities and offering the flexibility of courses to meet both their needs and the needs of the respective Services.

Clements Affidavit at 4.

ORDERED that defendants' motion to dismiss, or, in the alternative, for summary judgment be treated as one for summary judgment and as such, is hereby granted; and it is further

ORDERED that plaintiffs' motion for partial summary judgment be and the same is hereby denied.

——— ———,
Judge.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Civil Action No. 1825-73

Civil Action No. 1826-73

DON EDWARDS, ET AL., Plaintiffs, *v.* JAMES R. SCHLESINGER, ET AL., Defendants.

JEROME WALDIE, ET AL., Plaintiffs, *v.* JAMES R. SCHLESINGER, ET AL., Defendants.

ERRATA

Page 2, line 21: "respective academy" should read "respective academies."
Page 4, line 11: "discretionary" should read "discriminatory."
Page 9, line 15: "grounds" should read "ground."
Page 10, line 22: "Lehnhausen v. Lake Shore Auto Parts Co." should be underscored.
Page 11, line 4: "Lehnhausen" should be underscored.
Page 11, line 6: "Kahn" should be underscored.
Page 14, line 40: "nations" should read "nationals."
Page 15, line 18: omit comma following "*Reed.*"

——— ———,
Judge.

Date June 20, 1974.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. I think, Mr. Secretary, it's pretty clear. I'm not a lawyer, and I think lawyers confuse things more than they help them sometimes. Perhaps if we had more nonlawyers look at these things, it would be better.

Secretary CALLAWAY. Let me say, Mr. Wilson, I'm a nonlawyer and the reason I was rambling is because my lawyers have given me very vague opinions, but we'd be glad to supply one. But some of the attorneys say it would take congressional input; some say it would not. I think that's where we end up.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, again Mr. Daniel referred to it; you allow women into the ROTC and you allow them to attend the Army War College. I just wonder if we're not playing with a little bit of tradition here, that West Point, and the Naval Academy, and the Air Force Academy have a tradition established that, "By God, we're going to have just men there, and that's it, and we're not going to break that tradition down."

Is this what we are really getting at? Isn't it true that it's the traditional thing, that you want to retain this just for men, and you don't want to change that tradition? When you get to this thing about the pushups and the pullups, that's a little silly, when you keep getting at the inability of women to compete physically with men, just because they can't do pushups and pullups.

What is your response to this question on tradition, and so forth?

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Wilson, I certainly wouldn't deny that West Point has traditions. I don't know of any institution in America that has more sacred traditions that are believed in by the graduate.

To the extent that that keeps West Point from being innovative, that's wrong. But traditions are certainly not all bad. A great deal of the courage of West Point graduates is brought about by the tradition of the famous and great men and leaders who have served before them, and the tradition of them. So the traditions exist, I don't deny, and that may be a reason why some people at West Point don't want to admit women. I don't deny that.

But I still go back to the thought that we are being asked to reply to very different thoughts in people's minds, and I don't know whether your thought when you asked the question is: Are you talking about a separate track, a very different one, a lowering of physical requirements?

Mr. **Charles Wilson.** No; I think women are capable of performing the physical requirements, the athletic requirements, maybe different types of athletics, but all men don't do the same thing at the Academies. There's no question in my mind but that there are qualified women out here who could attend any of our Academies and perform just as capably as the men.

Secretary **Callaway.** Mr. Wilson, let me say the others I've talked to who are proponents of women at West Point have a very different image from what you have; they have an image of a very separate track, and we're sort of required to respond to both images without knowing.

Now, on the image of which you are speaking, are there women who are physically capable of doing what men are doing? Although a woman is different in her anatomy, where you get a woman of equally high physical competence as a man, though it may be a little different because of her physical differences, I think we would all agree that there are women who could make the West Point physical rigors that we have. There are women who could come to New Cadet Barracks and who could make that run that General Knowlton referred to over the rough terrain, and all of that. There are women who could do that.

If we adopted that, as I testified to the chairman, in my opinion, we could do this without substantially changing the Spartan atmosphere, the total immersion atmosphere at West Point. The women would then become a part of all that, would be expected to do the drilling, the intramural athletics, and all those things that both the men and the women would be expected to do.

I just have the feeling, however, that because there wouldn't be many women who would either want that, or desire it, or be physically capable of it, in my judgment, we would be looked upon as providing some very token kind of response to equal opportunity. Women would continually be wanting to come in in larger and larger numbers until we got to that lowering of standards. Now, that's just my opinion.

Mr. **Fisher.** The committee will be in recess for 10 minutes to answer a quorum call.

[Whereupon a 10-minute recess was taken from 11:15 a.m. to 11:25 a.m.]

Mr. **Fisher.** The committee will come to order.

Because of our time situation we'll move along. The other members have told me they will be back shortly. Here they come already, some of them.

Mr. Wilson, you may proceed with your questions.

Mr. **Charles Wilson.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, another thing you mentioned was, as I recall, that because things have been working so well in the past, and the way it has gone with the Acadeny, why change a good thing. This is right, isn't it?

Secretary **Callaway**. That's paraphrasing it; yes, sir.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. One of the great things about our country, it seems to me, is that we progress and we don't stay in the same mold all the time. If we did that, I suppose we never would have had modern plumbing, or modernity in our advanced vehicles.

Don't you feel that there might be reasons to consider, even changes in this type of tradition, that have produced a good thing in the past, but that might possibly improve with changes of the type we are talking about?

Secretary **Callaway**. Yes, sir, I certainly do. I think that any of us with the responsibility for West Point would make a great mistake if we merely relied on past traditions. The past traditions that were sacrosanct 25 years ago were such things that every cadet took the precise same course. It was felt by some that it wouldn't be West Point if everybody didn't take the precise same course. We even had a rule that every cadet recited every day in every class.

These were traditions that served West Point well, and should not be changed without firm consideration. But today that has been changed enormously. The opportunities for different kinds of curricula, for different people to advance in things that are important to them, where if they had had a few years of college, as many have before they come, not to require them to take the same freshman courses again. These opportunities today are totally different from 25 years ago. It's somewhat of a shock for an old graduate to go there and suddenly find there's no reveille at West Point, to find that the plebe system is totally changed from what it was 20 years ago. The concept that many had at New Cadet Barracks, that you have to tear a man down before you can build him up, that's not a part of West Point in anybody's concept today. All of these changes were good.

Now, I don't say that we at West Point should say because of tradition don't admit women, but I do think that we should be very cautious in doing anything that fundamentally changes West Point, and if we ever take women, I think we should be very careful not to do it in a way that takes away that oneness of experience that all West Point graduates feel, that gives them the core that General Knowlton speaks of that does give a stability to the entire officer corps of the Army. That's essential, and that's vital.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. It's been said by some of the other academies that there is a larger percentage of academy graduates who stay in the service, and therefore you get your dollar back from the investment you put into them, than there are in the ROTC or OCS or other ways of becoming officers.

Perhaps this is the reason that women who would like to make a career out of the military would like to have the privilege of going to one of the academies, because of the promotion opportunities, the opportunities to progress in the military, might be greater. General Weyand, of course, is an exception to that system. He was an ROTC graduate. But it probably is true that the academy graduate is going to go further, the average one, than the average person who comes from other ways of becoming an officer, isn't it?

Secretary **Callaway**. Mr. Wilson, let me say that all of us in the Army are committed to the fact that every officer in the Army, male or female, West Point, ROTC, or OCS, once they become second lieutenants and become officers, are considered absolutely equal, without looking in any way at the background, insofar as promotion opportunities are concerned. That is an absolute commitment on our part, and there's no question that in the Army we see the OCS and ROTC graduates doing outstanding jobs in every field in which they have endeavored.

I think General Weyand perhaps has some figures that might be of interest to you on that.

General WEYAND. Sir, 4 of our 12 four-star generals are non-Academy graduates: 22 of our lieutenant generals, half of them, and just about a hundred of our major generals, are non-Academy graduates.

We have moved quite a ways in recent years along the path that you just mentioned.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. We have a great officer here who serves in the Legislature, and many members of this committee and Congress were disappointed when he was passed over for brigadier general. He's here in the room today. I don't want to put him on the spot. Scooter Burke got his in the field. I think he was promoted in the field, and he has earned every battle award that is possible. He's a Medal of Honor winner, and he probably is as popular and as well-liked as anyone here. As I say; I don't want to put him on the spot, but, by golly, we were sure disappointed, and I was just wondering whether the fact that he didn't go to the right school or something may have prevented him from this opportunity.

General WEYAND. I can't believe that, sir. Certainly, if we go to combat, I would be very happy to have Scooter as my commander.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. I bet you would. He's a great one.

General WEYAND. I would feel fairly safe.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. The only other thing I have is comparing the cost of ROTC training with the academy training. Perhaps you may want to put the figures in the record. Yesterday the Air Force witnesses indicated that it costs $79,000 to educate a cadet at the Air Force Academy, and they used a figure of $13,000 for ROTC, which I thought was low. It seems to me that couldn't have included all of the tuition. It would probably be closer to $20,000, I would imagine. Wouldn't you say so, from your figures?

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Wilson, we would like to furnish those for the record. But the costs are comparable to what the Air Force Academy gives. My guess is they were giving a nonscholarship. Our scholarship costs of ROTC are higher than the figures they gave.

[Additional information furnished:]

Comparison of the cost of ROTC training with the USMA training—personnel investment cost, per person, fiscal year 1973

USMA:		ROTC (Nonaviation cadet):	
4 years	$64, 550	Nonscholarship	$9, 651
		1 year scholarship	10, 261
		2 year scholarship	12, 269
		3 year scholarship	14, 365
		4 year scholarship	18, 438
		ROTC flight instruction	1, 073

NOTE.—ROTC costs do not include Government funds and grants awarded to educational institutions through numerous Federal programs.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. You see, this cost differential is causing concern among many Members of Congress. It's not of concern to me. I'm not after the academies, by any means, the way some Members are, who would like to do away with the academies completely, and they're trying to compare the costs of the ROTC training as against the costs of the academy training as a reason that, "Well, we can get good, qualified officers at ROTC. Why spend this extra money?, "And they have this special sort of a sentiment."

Again, just from a commonsense standpoint, I think that I would try to find every way possible, unless you are just so committed the other way, to give women the opportunity, because I think this is going to be a condition that they can use, that you make $79,000 or $80,000 worth of education available with the specialties in the aerospace field in the Air Force Academy, and so forth, and in engineering at West Point and they may feel that they should have the same opportunity, as taxpayers.

I only suggest that. I know it's not going to have any great influence on you, but I think it's something you ought to give some thought to.

General **Knowlton**. May I add something there, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. Certainly.

General **Knowlton**. As you know, in the Regular Army, the commissioned second lieutenants in the Regular Army, about 45 percent will come from West Point, one source, and about 55 percent will come from the 300-odd institutions that have advanced ROTC, or from the graduates of OCS. So we depend upon West Point for the single large group input, from one place, to set group standards in all the things that are important, in professionalism, in ethics, integrity, and that sort of thing. It doesn't take anything away from the individual who comes from the other, but, as General Weyand indicated, they look to the West Point group for group standards.

One of the differences between ROTC and West Point is, of course, that the West Point environment is total for the 4 years.

The other thing is, I look at advertisements encouraging one to support civilian universities, in terms of the giving of gifts. They always make the point that tuition at a civilian university only pays one-third of the cost per student; the rest of it is borne by the invested capital, the donations, the amount of money the universities have behind them, plus grants, and so on. Therefore, under those circumstances, inevitably the cost of an ROTC graduate is going to be less than the military academy one, because part of that cost is being borne by the institution itself, whereas at West Point the costs are being borne almost exclusively by the U.S. Government.

But it is a very important group input, that 45 percent, from the one single institution.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. Mr. Chairman, I have no other questions.

I just want to inquire, however, is it the intention of the Chair to have a panel of women eventually? I had an interesting discussion with a young lady, who is a captain in the Air Force, who is in disagreement with me on my views, but who had a very interesting story about her experience in the field, a trial that she just went through in the Air Force, where she was one of 600, and her testimony might be of great interest somewhere along the line. I don't know, she would probably have to be cleared by her commanding general, but she has a very interesting story, and one that would be against my position here. I think it would be worthwhile for the record.

Mr. Fisher. I'm glad you brought that up. If you give her name and address to Mr. Hogan, we will see to it that she is given an opportunity to testify. I think it would be very appropriate. Mr. Treen?

Mr. Treen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Knowlton, I would appreciate your referring to page 5 of your prepared statement, the last paragraph on the page, in which you state that you would "like to emphasize that the Army does not assign women to units expected to see combat in case of national emergency. Having witnessed three wars I understand why women are not required by law or by executive order to serve in this role."

I wonder if you would elaborate a little bit on that last sentence?

General Knowlton. I'm not sure I fully understand the question, Mr. Treen.

Mr. Treen. You said that, having witnessed three wars, you understand why women are not required by law or by executive order to serve in the combat role.

General Knowlton. What I was trying to reflect here was my feeling, expressed earlier in the statement, that the ground combat environment, it is my personal feeling, is not a place where I think women should serve. Again, that's my individual preference.

I have seen ground combat, not only in our own Army, but I've also witnessed it in some of the others, and I think we are correct in our policy not to assign women to ground combat units, or ground combat positions.

Mr. Treen. Yes, I understood your position. I just wondered if in that sentence you had in mind some specific things that occurred in combat that would be difficult for women to sustain, capture or other things, if you had something else in mind in making that statement.

General Knowlton. I didn't have specifics, but I think you made a very good point, sir. That was made earlier, I believe, in the committee's discussions on the question of women as prisoners and the effect that this might have upon the national policy. My own statement, however, refers more to my own close observation of ground combat, the tough, nasty, physical, difficult environment, together with, of course, the presence of death on the battlefield.

I think it's not only my own position, but a lot of other males just don't think that is the place for a woman if we can help it.

Now, I grant that in emergency situations, in the opening of the West, or something like that, there have been cases where women in an area under attack have had to hold guns, have had to shoot. I think that's quite different than doing it as a matter of policy in peacetime for a cadre in the Army.

Mr. Treen. General Knowlton, in referring to your current admissions policy, is West Point admitting any percentage of students who upon admission are not qualified for combat?

General Knowlton. No, sir, we are not.

Mr. Treen. One hundred percent qualified for combat?

General Knowlton. One hundred percent qualified, yes. And we look very carefully into each case, and also to be sure there is a reasonable expectation that at the end of 4 years he will still be qualified, because we do have a very tough physical regime, and, as you know, there are some who by the end of the 4 years may have physical problems that came on during the 4 years that will keep them from being commissioned in the combat branch.

We do our best to insure, not only that they are qualified when they come in, but that they have the prospect of remaining qualified throughout the tough, demanding schedule.

Mr. TREEN. Thank you, General.

Mr. Secretary, I have a couple of questions.

First of all, I want to compliment you on your complete statement and the firmness of your responses, and just to mention that I personally am most pleased, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, with the dedication that you have brought to the office of the Secretary of the Army. I'm very proud that you're there.

Would you tell me what percentage of women are being enlisted now? This gets away from the Academy a little bit, but what percentage of women in our current volunteer environment are we enlisting?

Secretary CALLAWAY. Month by month, Mr. Treen, it's on the order of magnitude of around 10 percent. I could supply for the record each month how many we've enlisted.

Mr. TREEN. No, that's all right. I just wanted the general trend.

Mr. Secretary, I guess I approach this question with prejudice. This has built up over the years one way or another, but I'm trying to be objective about it, and I have not made up my mind about this legislation.

It would appear to me that good points were made, if we concede that our policy is going to be to prevent women from being in combat. I think a lot of the points that you make, and other witnesses have made, in opposition are valid and are hard to argue against. But I think the battle is going to be here on the floor of the Congress, "Well, why not women in combat?" and that "That is a discrimination, and that sort of discrimination is not permissible today."

I have a little difficulty philosophically with the idea that every distinction is an unfair discrimination. Our courts talk about invidious discrimination, or unfair discrimination.

I just wondered what your thoughts might be along that line.

I think this is one of the areas that we are going to get into discussion on on the floor, the difference between a discrimination per se, which in its technical sense does not imply unfairness, and then the type of discrimination that's been struck down by our courts, invidious discrimination, or unfair discrimination. I start with the feeling that it is not unfair for this country to declare that it is our policy not to permit our women to be in combat. That is a discrimination based upon sex. But to me I cannot accept at this point that that's an unfair discrimination.

If you have any comments on that, I would appreciate them.

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Treen, let me say that I agree with you.

I feel that there are very valid reasons, totally fair, why it is not in the best interests of this country to have women in combat, and we've discussed a lot of them, and General Knowlton has, and General Weyand has. I think they're almost so obvious they don't need discussion, and yet, to the extent they need discussion, they can be discussed; in the confusion of the ground combat environment, the need for having the physical and mental qualities under stress and the need for the belief by everyone there in the leadership that's there is total. Without belief in the lieutenants and captains and colonels who are there, it all falls apart, and we've seen that in every war.

Now at the present time it's my personal judgment that the attitude of the American soldier is not such that he sees the female role as one of a platoon leader in combat, of a company commander in combat, or doing the kinds of things, with the kinds of leadership skills, that platoon leaders and company commanders in combat do. I personally don't think that many soldiers see a woman in that role. I think that the attitude of most soldiers in combat would be that they would be very uncomfortable in that role. They would see the woman as someone who needs to be protected rather than their leader whose judgment they must have enormous respect for.

That's my personal opinion, that a great many soldiers would feel that way, and, to the extent that one soldier feels that way, he's being deprived of the leadership that is absolutely vital to him.

If, on the other hand, the situation is such that women are accepted in combat—and this is the question that I see you are asking—if the American public accepts them in combat, if they are out being trained daily in combat roles, if they are in the tanks, firing tanks, and they're doing all of these things, and the American Army and the American public accepts it, and that's the way we're doing it—in my judgment it is not correct—but if that's the way we're doing it, then I think women should go to West Point and should do all of the things that men do and should become part of that team that is trained at West Point for combat training. In my judgment, we are a very, very long way from that.

Mr. **Treen**. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

In pursuing a problem that I have in my mind—and I think that a number of Members share this—we are trying to separate out those aspects of unfairness that might be involved in not permitting women to go to an academy.

One of them that occurs to some people—or is suggested by some people—is that here is a great education provided at great cost to the Government that we are denying to women. That raises the question of whether, one might argue, that has a very valid national purpose, but from the point of view of the women, here is something that is available, that is an education that Congressmen can appoint young men to and provide them with that education, and that women are not able to get, and I don't think the ROTC is comparable in terms of the expenses and allowances, and so forth, is it? I might digress a minute to ask you that question. In terms of education and the benefits, can one obtain similar value at ROTC? When I say "value" that excludes any argument that West Point might be a better school. But in terms of course offerings, uniform allowance, or other benefits, can the same be obtained in the ROTC program?

Secretary **Callaway**. Mr. Treen, we can supply for the record the precise numbers. But I think the quick answer would be that yes, it can be the same thing. While a cadet may make a few more dollars a month in salary, he has certain expenses that he must pay that the ROTC cadet does not.

Again, we will supply that for the record.

Mr. TREEN. I think that is something that ought to be in the record so that we will have it, and have it up-to-date, because the argument will be made that you get a lot more when you go to West Point. You get a salary, in addition to tuition being covered, and so forth.

Secretary CALLAWAY. We'll supply that.

Mr. TREEN. The difference in benefits and the difference in expenses that they are prepared to pay.

[The information to be supplied is as follows:]

In response to the question on course offerings, the USMA curriculum consists of two complementary parts—a core program which is essentially prescribed, and an elective program which is individually designed, by and large. The core program contains the elements of a broad, general education and is designed to give the cadet a fundamental knowledge of the arts and sciences. The elective program enables the cadet to experience a reasonable degree of concentration in areas in which he may have special interests or aptitudes.

Under the ROTC program, the requirements are that the scholarship student be enrolled in or accepted for enrollment as a regularly matriculated student in any major course of study leading to a baccalaureate degree, beginning within one year of the date on which he is awarded the scholarship. A student committed to the ministry is ineligible.

All institutions participating in the ROTC program must agree to the establishment of a Department of Military Science as an integral academic and administrative department. Each ROTC cadet is required to participate in the prescribed military instruction course. Appropriate academic credit is granted for completing courses of the Department of Military Science applicable toward graduation.

In response to the question regarding differences in benefits and expenses between the Military Academy and ROTC, detailed data on the allowances received by the USMA cadet and the ROTC cadet is as follows:

USMA CADET

Receives: Free tuition; subsistence; free board, ration allowance; monthly pay (less income tax and social security) net, $252.57: To cover cost of: Cadet uniform and repairs to uniforms, barber, laundry and dry cleaning, text books, class activities, newspapers, magazines, publications, activity fees.

Net balance Monthly for Cadet for other personal expenses and personal use:

First class	$158.58
Second class	133.58
Third class	118.58
Fourth class	75.00

Examples of other personal expenses: Shoe repair, athletic and educational trips, personal items, school supplies, travel home and return from leave.

ROTC CADET (SCHOLARSHIP)

Receives: Tuition fees, including registration and matriculation fees; laboratory fees, expenses and deposits; text books, workbooks; course equipment; graduation fees, related expenses; health fee, student activity fee; athletic fee, library fee; transcript charges, costs of student publications; classroom materials.

Subsistence allowance: $100 per month for: Room and board.

ROTC uniforms, free issue. Upon graduation, if he enters Regular Army, he must purchase his officer uniforms. If he enters Army Reserve, he receives uniform allowance.

The USMA cadet is a member of the active Army on active duty. As such, he receives a monthly pay equal to one-half of the basic pay of a Second Lieutenant with under two cumulative years' service. Out of his pay he is expected to pay for his uniforms and many of the other amenities of cadet life. His monthly pay is budgeted to provide for his fixed requirements as shown above. At graduation, the cadet budget attempts to provide for a $1,000 balance to carry the Second Lieutenant over until he reaches his first assignment station and until he receives his first monthly pay, and $475 to pay for his officer uniforms.

The USMA cadet is provided medical and dental services and is covered under the Federal Social Security Program (pay deduction, FICA).

The USMA cadet is not eligible for any other scholarship or financial grants for education during his four years of attendance at the Academy.

The ROTC cadet is not a member of the active Army. The ROTC cadet under the four-year scholarship program receives pay and allowances as shown above. His uniforms are issued to him at no cost. (The ROTC uniform may be a government issue uniform, or the educational institution may draw commutation in lieu of government issue and purchase a cadet uniform from commercial sources of any color or type that does not conflict with Army regulations.)

The ROTC cadet under the scholarship receives a $100 monthly subsistence allowance to cover his room and board. This allowance is tax exempt. He is free to engage in part-time employment. He is eligible for any other scholarship or financial aid that may be available to him. Medical services are provided.

Mr. TREEN. Just one last question, Mr. Secretary.

What is your attitude toward the idea of a separate military academy for women, both in terms of the proposition of isolation and in terms of that being the alternative to having to bring women into the established academies? And I have in mind one military academy for all branches for women when I ask the question. I'm not saying I have that in mind as a proposal.

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Treen, I'll just give my personal opinion. Others might want to give their personal opinions.

It is not something that we, the Army, have taken a position on, after having thoroughly looked at all the consequences. My first opinion would be that it is not needed. It is not needed because the kinds of things that that academy would be expected to do are being done extremely well today by the many ROTC colleges throughout America, and the academic programs that are available in the many different ROTC colleges are adequate, and are there, and so it's not necessary, in my view, to establish such an academy.

I would take the second personal opinion, however, that if the alternative to admitting women to West Point were a separate academy for the three services, then I would much prefer that alternative to admitting women to West Point.

Mr. TREEN. All right. What I'm trying to do is isolate what could be the claims of unfairness here.

Now, even assuming that the ROTC would provide the same opportunity as the academy, and the women would have their opportunity in the ROTC program, you still have, of course, the fact that each Member of the Congress can appoint to the academies five students in each academy at any given time, so we don't have that privilege as Members of Congress with respect to ROTC, and, to the extent that we don't have it, then the women whom we represent do not have it. I don't know whether it would be possible to extend that to Members of Congress so that we could eliminate that claim of unfair discrimination or not.

But if you have a response or reaction, I would be pleased to hear it.

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Treen, I would say that if that is perceived by the Members of Congress to be a serious problem, the remedy to that problem would be to change the ROTC appointment procedures so that Congressmen did have some input somewhat similar.

I'm not recommending that, but I say that would be a remedy if that's seen as a problem.

I basically think that, while it is true that Members of Congress through the appointment system can appoint people to West Point—

General Knowlton may want to speak more on this—but in the present class coming in we have some 10,000 applicants, from which we take only about 10 percent. So because our standards are so much higher than the average applicant, even though, yes, you have the appointment authority, it's still a pretty competitive process. So it's entirely different from the competitive process of ROTC, but, to the extent that that's a problem, that could be corrected by changing the ROTC procedures.

I think the problem that we in the Army have in answering some of these questions is still the difference in perceptions in people's minds.

If the unfairness that you speak of is the fact that West Point offers a fine education that a woman cannot avail herself of, I would say that even though many of us are extremely proud of the academic education that one can get at West Point—we're extremely proud—I don't think even the most partisan of us could say that it's of an order of magnitude better than the finest civilian education available. We like to think it's on par with the best, but as an academic experience, there's nothing that unique about West Point. We think it's excellent, but we think there are hundreds of excellent academic experiences that are on a par, and that are equal, and certainly no one is denied an opportunity because they couldn't go to that particular college, because others are equally good.

The unique experience of West Point is the compiling of that fine academic atmosphere together with an immersion in a 24 hours a day, 1 year-long after another, summer, winter, fall, spring, which ties in with the combat training and military effectiveness which, as General Knowlton has testified to, is all day long. When you finish classes you go to intramurals; when you finish intramurals you go to study. You do these things in an atmosphere. When the weekend comes, you don't go home, you stay there at West Point doing things which all tie together to make an experience. Now, that experience is designed for combat.

So I think we can say to our girls that, "If you are not allowed in a combat role, this is not an experience that was designed for you."

Mr. **Treen**. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. Very well.

Mr. Montgomery.

Mr. **Montgomery**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll try to be brief.

If it's in order, I would like to ask, starting with the lieutenant, how you feel about bringing women into the Academy at West Point, and then the cadet captain.

Identify yourself, please.

STATEMENT OF LT. MICHAEL KIRBY, GRADUATE OF WEST POINT, CLASS OF 1974

Lieutenant **Kirby**. Yes, sir; 2d Lt. Michael Kirby.

Sir, I feel that the best answer to that question could be explained to you if I can convey to you, after 4 years at West Point just recently ended, what the essence of West Point has been to me, and I think the essence of West Point emerges in the commonality of the whole experience at the Military Academy. It's right from working, playing, and living together. I knew, when I sat on the football field to get my diploma, that everyone who sat there with me has gone through exactly the same thing as I did. They lived in exactly the same way as I did. I'd been associated with them on a completely intimate basis, and that's a great motivating factor and a comforting factor too. But it's the right way to get across what West Point really is, the Spartan track, the single Spartan track, that's everyone's on.

Sir, I don't think that under any setup that I've heard of women could pursue that same single Spartan track and receive the same commonality of experience that I had, and receive the real essence that West Point has brought to me.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF CADET CAPTAIN STEPHEN TOWNES, FIRST-CLASSMAN, WEST POINT MILITARY ACADEMY

Cadet Captain TOWNES. Sir, Cadet Capt. Stephen Townes.

Sir, I'm a West Point cadet now, and I am proud of it. I'm proud of it because West Point is tough. I went there because West Point, I felt, was the toughest place I could go. It's given me the kind of challenge that has forced me to develop to internalize in myself a sort of self-discipline that I think it's going to take to be a good officer and serve the U.S. Army and serve my country.

When you're talking about what I feel is a weakening of the Academy standards, in disciplines and those sort of things, by setting some sort of a crumbling effect into the rock wall of what I call the ironclad discipline, the rugged training. It's like a rock wall. There are a lot of foundations to that rock wall, and one of them is this total immersion process. Secretary Callaway mentioned it, and I'd like to amplify on it a little bit.

It's not just the classroom; it's not the parade field. It's like what I'm doing this summer. I'm in charge of running men around the mountainsides for 2 months long, making them negotiate barbed wire, causing them to grubble around in the dirt like men, and it's this total immersion, in a 4-year soldierly process of discipline and high standards that I think is the hallmark of what an Academy graduate likes to think that he is.

I mention this rock wall, this rock wall of discipline. I think by injecting women into this last bastion of military puritanism that West Point truly is, I think you're going to start a weakening process of that wall, and thereby a weakening process of the Army.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Thank you very much for that clear and concise statement.

I know you can't take any polls at West Point, but generally what is the conversation about these committee hearings, and do you get any feel of what the other cadets might feel?

Cadet Captain TOWNES. You are correct, sir, polls are not taken. However, Lieutenant Kirby and I have, in casual conversation, mentioned this problem to fellow cadets, in this case fellow officers now. I spoke with one man in particular, Mr. Gerald T. Sullivan, an associate of mine who's in the class of 1976, and he has not yet incurred his commitment. But he stated to me categorically that, should women be admitted before his commitment is incurred, he would resign.

I think that is indicative of perhaps the kind of sentiment that pervades the Corps of Cadets.

We are not pretending to put ourselves on a level above women. True, there is a bit of chauvinism in all this. We're just saying that West Point is our school; we're proud of it; we're proud of what it stands for and what we think we are doing there. We don't want to see the high standards that we have set for ourselves diluted in any way.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Thank you.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I'd be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON. Last year I was visiting at the Air Force Academy, and I asked this question of many of the young men whom we met with, and, strangely enough, I talked to about a dozen and about 10 of those 12 thought it would be the greatest thing in the world if they had women in the Academy. Some of them said, "Gee, it would clean up the language around here." And they had various reasons why they thought it might be a good deal. But it was a different response that I got. I don't know whether it was just that they knew that I was supporting the Academy and they thought that it was the right thing to say, or what, but you do get different views from different people, I guess.

Cadet Captain TOWNES. Mr. Wilson, that probably brings about the question: Do I like girls? I can categorically state that I like girls. In fact, some of my best friends are girls. I just don't think they ought to be at the Military Academy, sir.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Secretary and the Superintendent for bringing these two fine young gentlemen here today. Whether you would agree with them or not, they certainly express themselves well, and they make you feel proud to be an American.

Really, I'm trying to search for the answer on how I would make a vote, and I haven't made up my mind, and we need this information.

Thank you for bringing these young men.

My last question, and it comes up from a discussion Mr. Wilson had and in which Mr. Daniel is interested also:

If the Academy graduates are not better qualified for promotion, then how do you justify the additional training costs, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Montgomery, we've tried to, in several ways, speak to that.

One of them is the combat qualifications we've spoken so much about. The West Point graduates go into the combat arms at a ratio of many times more than the ROTC cadets go, and I think they form the core, not only of the total Army, as General Knowlton has said, but particularly of the combat arms, and I think the additional training and additional expense is worthwhile. I think it's proved itself.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. You've actually answered it for me then, if your figures are correct, that more West Point graduates go into combat and are involved in combat than other methods of training.

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Montgomery, if I might just briefly simplify that?

We have in the Army three kinds of branches: one, the combat arms, the infantry, the artillery, the armor, the air defense; two, combat support, which is things like combat engineers, combat signal, military police and military intelligence; and the third is combat services support, which includes the finance, quartermaster—that kind of thing.

If you divide it basically into those three areas, over the past 11 years, 75 percent of West Point graduates have gone into combat arms versus 40 percent of ROTC graduates. 75 percent versus 40 for an 11-year average. But when you get into the combat services support, which is finance, quartermaster, and so on, and realize that some of our West Point cadets become incapacitated for a commission in combat arms, and must take, because of their physical incapacity, to take the combat services support, the 11-year average is 4 percent for West Point graduates and 32 percent for ROTC graduates. I think that shows the order of magnitude of the difference of how we have for the past 11 years, and really for all the history of West Point, looked at the combat arms orientation of a West Point cadet.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Thank you, sir.

I have only one other thing, Mr. Chairman, that I'm certainly glad to hear that General Abrams is making a good recovery, and it's nice to have General Weyand testifying here today. I had the pleasure of seeing General Weyand in Vietnam many times, and he's very, very familiar with the combat situation.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. FISHER. Let me ask one or two questions, sort of by way of recapitulation, and to clarify one or two items that are relevant.

The committee has quite a responsibility here, and we are going to try to face up to it, whichever way it goes, and we talk about combat, and that's the key to this whole thing—that's the key.

General Knowlton, when you say that you are opposed to women being assigned to combat roles, do you say that because you think it's bad as a national policy, or do you say that because you believe the women are not physically capable, or otherwise capable, of measuring up to the requirements of a combat soldier?

General KNOWLTON. Mr. Chairman, I would say it would be a combination of those things.

The ground combat environment, as I mentioned before, is pretty tough; it's pretty brutal; it's pretty nasty. Battles have a way of starting when everybody is fatigued, tired, and the kind of physical strength that is required is something that is more naturally that of men than of women, and even the American Medical Association has agreed with that.

The other problem, of course, is that the environment of ground combat is pretty total in regard to all the bodily functions, all of the other things that mean that you are living closely together. There are no ladies' latrines in a rice paddy, that sort of thing, which makes it pretty difficult in that environment for a woman.

I also thought that General Weyand expressed very well the feeling that we also have an obligation to the individual soldier himself, when he puts his life in the hands of his leader, as to who that leader might be in order to gain his confidence on the battlefield, and it has been my experience that the leader very often has to win his spurs by doing better than any of the individual soldiers the variety of things that are required of the combat leader, whether it's shooting, whether it's physical, or whatever it may be.

For all of these reasons I personally just don't think it's the place for them.

Mr. Fisher. Very well.

General Weyand, do you share that view?

General Weyand. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. And Bill has touched on it, as I did, and as the Secretary did, that it has to do with this relationship between the leader and the men. It's very important. We don't understand it as well as we would like to, but we've all experienced it.

We do have grave reservations and doubts that women—and if they would go, under one proposal, to the Academy, that means they would be officers; that means in combat they would be leaders—and we do have grave doubts as to whether men of the type that we have would in these circumstances of crisis, when men are confused and beset on all sides by doubts and excruciating pressures, when, in fact, you might say that they are susceptible to any reason to find calmer ground, under those circumstances, would they follow their women? We just don't really know. We doubt it.

We know we have had Joan of Arc; we've had the Troung sisters; and I'm sure throughout history many other wonderful women leaders, tacticians, strategists. But Joan of Arc was a saint. She got her directions from on High, and we don't have too many of those.

I think about that old World War II cartoon of Willie and Joe up on the top of the mountain saying, "Well, here comes another second lieutenant with the rations," and we always used to laugh about that. But seriously, sometime during that day Willie and Joe would have to respect and respond to the example and orders of that lieutenant, and I suspect that if that lieutenant had been a young woman that Willie and Joe's cyncism would have been heightened.

Mr. Fisher. General Knowlton, we've had some reference here to problems about recruiting enough people to attend the Military Academy. I know some of the Members have mentioned difficulties in their own districts.

Would you have any comment on that?

General Knowlton. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that you asked that question because this is the best year in West Point's history in terms of numbers of qualified applicants. We have over 11,000 young Americans trying to get into West Point this year. We have never had over 10,000 before. Of that 11,000 well over 6,000 have received nominations. Usually it's around 5,800. And we are just very excited about the numbers and the quality of the young men fighting to get into West Point this year.

For that reason, I will probably bring in the largest class that has ever come into West Point, because I hate to leave the well-qualified young men on the waiting list. So thank you for giving me the opportunity for saying that, sir.

Mr. Fisher. Very well.

As I see this—and I'll express my view, and see if you agree with me—if this committee is to decide, and the Congress is to decide, to admit women to the service academies—and we may do it. That remains to be seen. That's the purpose of these hearings—if that happens, then we must proceed on the assumption that they will be available for combat duty, as I see it. Some people would disagree with that and say, "Not necessarily, because there are a lot of people who go to the Academy who don't go to combat," which is true statistically of a good many at least. You've detailed all that here today.

But if they were not going to be available for combat, can we afford, from a cost-effective standpoint, to train any cadet, man or woman, in these Academies at the present cost for noncombat roles?

What would be your comment on that?

I think that's very fundamentally a problem here. If they are not going to be combat—I'm not saying what we will do about that, but if the Congress declines to repeal the present laws—and we have some, particularly with regard to the Air Force and the Navy—which prohibits them from being committed to combat, and then you have your own regulations and policies that we're not going to do that, and, therefore, we're going to admit girls to the Academy for noncombat roles. Can we afford to do that cost-effective-wise? What's your comment?

Secretary CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, my comment would be that I agree. I think it would not be cost-effective to have people come into West Point who from the very outset it would be known clearly would not be eligible to be combat leaders.

I might, if I may, just say one other thing, Mr. Chairman. That I don't want anyone to think from any of the kinds of things that General Weyand or General Knowlton or the cadets or I have said that we have any question about the capability of the American women for leadership. I want to again state that we in the Army feel that some of our finest leaders are women. They have the capability to lead, and we respect that, and we in every way treat them as equals and, in some cases, superiors, to the men who are there.

I hope the point that comes through is that in the ground combat environment we think that that's an environment where it is not appropriate for them to be present, and especially present in a leadership capacity.

But I want to be very careful, for the record, that we, the Army, support the leadership of the women in this Army, and we are not reluctantly taking them. We encourage, and advocate, women in the leadership roles of the Army other than combat.

Mr. FISHER. Very well.

Do you share that view, General Knowlton?

General KNOWLTON. Mr. Chairman, I do, indeed, sir.

General WEYAND. And I do also, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Are there any other questions?

Mr. Hogan, our counsel, has a few questions.

Mr. HOGAN. How many cadets are at West Point, or will be at West Point by the end of the class, General?

General KNOWLTON. Mr. Hogan, it's a little tough to put a specific number on it.

I should point out that West Point has been building up since 1964 incrementally from the old authorization of 2,500 to the new authorization of 4,417, because of the geography at West Point and the fact that we had to knock down old buildings to put up new ones, as the Members well know, since they helped us with the construction program. We have been incrementally building up to that maximum figure. We will be at around 4,350, would be my guess, when we bring in the new class this summer. Next summer we will be up to 4,417. So we will be at approximately 4,350.

Mr. **Hogan**. General Weyand, during your experience in Vietnam did you notice any perceptible difference between the performance of a young West Point graduate in combat and the performance of young officers from other sources?

General **Weyand**. Sir, I do not recall having made any judgments like that. It just never crossed my mind as we assigned officers. In fact, now that you've asked it, I'm trying to think back on the great young commanders that I did witness over there, and I simply cannot recall whether a particular one was an Academy graduate or a non-Academy graduate. I simply don't know.

Mr. **Hogan**. So then I think you are saying that, at least from your observation, there was no perceptible difference in the performance of the young platoon leader, whether or not he was a West Point graduate or an ROTC product?

General **Weyand**. With the qualification that in most cases I was not aware of whether he was an Academy graduate.

Mr. **Hogan**. The Air Force and the Navy have indicated that it takes several years for a non-Academy career officer to catch up with his Academy counterpart, but from your testimony today where you indicate that all second lieutenants are alike, there seems to be some difference of opinion in the Army.

Would you care to comment on that?

General **Weyand**. Well, I don't know about that time to catch up. That, again, is one that I really haven't thought much about It seems to me that, I think, with the year groups they've moved along, both the non-Academy graduate and the Academy graduate, at about the same pace. They arrive at a time for consideration for promotion from first lieutenant to captain after approximately the same number of years of service. In terms of age, looking at the other extreme, the old men, I find that my peers who are Academy graduates are about my age.

Secretary **Callaway**. If I might comment on that?

I would like to say that there are several things here that might be quite important. We in the Army make every effort, a very genuine effort, from the time a man is a first lieutenant, or second lieutenant, to say and to mean, and for him to understand, that all second lieutenants are judged on their performance in the Army and not on their background. We do this because we want to be extremely fair, and not have some kind of preference for a person who came from West Point, and we think that's important, that they all be judged the same, and because of that, people like General Weyand, of habit, do not check into what's the background.

I was really rather surprised in my immediate office when I found out the other day, and they said, "Gee, this is the first time there has been no West Point graduate in the Secretary's office since perhaps forever," and it never occurred to me because I don't look at these officers as West Point graduates, or ROTC, or OCS. I look at them for the performance of their duty, and we think that's important, and I want to emphasize that.

The general feeling in the Army would be, however, that as the West Point graduate comes out, compared with the ROTC graduate, that there are a few years where the West Point graduate has had some experiences that the ROTC graduate would have to pick up. He hasn't had the same amount of summer training in the Army that a West Point graduate has.

This in no way says that the ROTC graduate is not totally as fully capable and as equal to the task, because we can see that he is. As a matter of fact, there are a great many in the Army who would say that the OCS graduate starts out ahead of everybody, because the OCS graduate has had a very intensive course in the doings of handling the Army at the company level. He's just come from the enlisted ranks in every case, or in almost every case, so he's been very involved with how the company level works, and he walks into the environment in the company, where he's far ahead of the West Point graduate. He's just come from it; he's had more instruction, and the West Point graduate must catch up. The OCS graduate must perhaps catch up in some education that perhaps he didn't have. So one gradually gets his education in the things that one must do to fill in the gaps that there might be in that education.

I might say that we in the Army look at them all as the same. We expect them, by their performance, to get promoted or not promoted.

Mr. Hogan. Do men and women officers compete for promotion in the Army?

Secretary Callaway. Yes, sir.

Mr. Hogan. Among themselves? A woman is competing with a man for promotion?

Secretary Callaway. In certain cases, yes. Title 10, United States Code, requires nine promotion lists or competitive categories. Two of these promotion lists, the Army Nurse Corps and the Army Medical Specialist Corps, are composed of male and female officers. Within these two categories men and women compete with each other. We do not assign a specific quota on how many women must be taken out of the total number of eligibles. Is that not correct, General Weyand?

General Weyand. Yes, that is correct, sir.

Mr. Hogan. Are the women competing with women, or are the women competing with men as well as women?

Secretary Callaway. In the categories that I am describing, they are competing with men and women. There is a list of, let's say, 500 officers, out of which 50, say, get chosen, and when that promotion board meets, it's looking at men and women, so they're competing with both men and women. I would point out that the Women's Army Corps category is composed exclusively of female officers; they compete only with each other for promotion. However, under the proposed Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA), male and female officers would compete with each other for promotion in all categories.

Mr. Hogan. One last question, Mr. Chairman.

General Knowlton, if women are to be accepted at the Military Academy, how long would it take you to prepare?

General Knowlton. Mr. Hogan, although we haven't gone into this in great detail, I would say it's related to the admission cycle, and we'd like to have about 20 months' leadtime, because we work with high school juniors toward the end of their junior year in getting them ready. I believe that it would be important that we have at least one complete turn of the admission cycle, and I think it's extremely important that if a young lady were to apply under these circumstances that she understand totally and thoroughly what it is that she is going to be coming into, because we have this problem, even with male candidates, who don't really understand all the facets of what they're going to be expected to do. That is, despite all of our educational procedures, one of the reasons that 10 percent don't make it through the intensive 7 weeks of the cycle. They have a vision of what they are going to be doing, which is not accurately related to what they will be doing. And for that reason, I would say at least one admission cycle, and probably part of another.

That's just an off-the-shoulder estimate, sir.

Mr. Hogan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Charles Wilson. Mr. Chairman, briefly just following up on Mr. Hogan's question.

Mr. Secretary, I'm a little concerned. Perhaps you may have given us arguments against the Academy in response to Mr. Hogan's questions.

You've indicated that you don't differentiate between Academy graduates and ROTC graduates or field commissioned people; you can't tell who came from where, and, apparently, they're all doing good in combat. Now why do we need this Academy then for this specialized combat training? You get your Scooter Burkes, your Audie Murphys appointed in the field, and you get your General Weyands who go through the ROTC program, and have been successful. Why do we need an Academy then?

I would hate to think that we wouldn't have one. But apparently you are training outstanding people through the ranks and through the ROTC programs who are doing an outstanding and excellent job in combat.

Now are the Academy graudates eventually going to become the administrators?

You haven't distinguished, to my satisfaction, now that they have anything special going for them by having gone through the Academy other than those who have become officers through other sources.

Secretary Callaway. Mr. Wilson, the reason that's a difficult question to answer is because there are certain policies that we think are sound, that we very much want to continue to advocate, and that all officers are looked upon as totally equal and are judged only on their performance, and I think if we went the other direction and said, "We are going to expect more from a West Point Officer than we do from an OCS or ROTC officer, it would be unfair to all three. So we very much don't want to do that, and, because of that, we don't look, as General Weyand didn't, and as I don't, at the background.

But, having said that, I think if you look through our history of what West Point graduates have done for this country, both in and out of combat, you will see it's a standard of excellence that cannot be matched by any institution in the world. I really believe that. I cannot think of an institution in the world that has produced so many people who have performed so well in stressful situations.

I would like to say I'll let that stand on its own, that West Point is cost effective for what it has given to this country, and will continue to do.

Mr. Charles Wilson. Thank you.

Mr. Fisher. Let me ask one concluding question. We have to cut this off in a little while.

I was just thinking, since Mrs. Holt has asked this of most of the witnesses who have appeared here—and she is one of our most faithful and valued members, but she was unavoidably absent today—and she raised the question with several about one aspect of the women being admitted to the academies; that is, that after they graduate presumably many of them would be married, and presumably many of them would engage in childbirth, and she has asked witnesses what effect that would have on their assignments, or their duties, in the military service. There have been various answers about, "Well, if we give them a month, or two months, during the time this happened."

Pursuing that same thought, let me see if you can respond to this If not, we'll just pass it over.

Would you think that a woman, say, who is pregnant, about 3 months or 6 months, and going back to the rice paddies as platoon leader, that that would have any adverse effect upon her capacity to lead a platoon in combat, the fact that she was pregnant and it was noticeable?

I'm not saying that she would be assigned under those conditions, but I would assume in battles sometimes there are no substitutes or alternatives, and I assume that's true under certain conditions.

What about that?

General **Weyand**. I think we would have to find a way, Mr. Chairman, to handle that situation. Most of our battles don't last 9 months, so we would have some time to make adjustments. [Laughter.]

Seriously, though, I really can't conceive of that situation actually happening.

Mr. **Fisher**. By that you mean probably you can't conceive of their being assigned to a combat role if they were expecting a child; is that right?

General **Weyand**. No, not under those conditions.

Mr. **Fisher**. I can't either. I agree with that.

But still, they're subject to call for combat duty whenever and wherever the occasion arises, so that might be a little bit of a problem that you would have to cope with, depending upon the circumstances in each case.

General **Weyand**. Exactly, sir.

Mr. **Charles Wilson**. Mr. Chairman, what you might do in that case is if a lady has to take 5 months off, for example, because of pregnancy, add 5 months to her tour of duty, and if she got in that condition by a military person add 5 months duty to him, too.

Mr. **Fisher**. Do any of you three—and you've been very helpful this morning, and very responsive—think of anything that has not been fully developed that you would like to add to your testimony? You may do so at this time. Or if not at the moment, when you look at your remarks, as I assume you will, the draft of them, if you desire, you certainly have permission to enlarge upon, clarify, or make such changes as you may find to be desirous.

General **Knowlton**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. With that, the committee will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

General **Weyand**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee adjourned at 12:30 p.m., to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2,
Washington, D.C., Tuesday, July 16, 1974.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:06 a.m. in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Lucien N. Nedzi (acting chairman) presiding.

Mr. NEDZI. The subcommittee will please come to order.

This morning we are continuing our hearings on the request to the committee by the Center for Women Policy Studies to the military academies. We have as our first witness a representative of the Center for Women Policy Studies, Mrs. Virginia M. Dondy.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MS. VIRGINIA M. DONDY, ACCOMPANIED BY MS. MARGARET GATES AND THOMAS MARTIN, REPRESENTING CENTER FOR WOMEN POLICY STUDIES

Ms. DONDY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have with me this morning Mr. Thomas Martin and Ms. Margaret Gates of the Center for Policy Studies.

Thank you for this opportunity to present testimony on behalf of H.R. 10705, and similar bills, the principal purpose of which is to admit women to the service academies.

The Center for Women Policy Studies is a nonprofit, tax exempt organization which seeks to improve the legal and economic status of women. Women in the armed services are a group whose problems are of special interest to the center.

Two years ago, two women, Cora Lee Cross and Jolene Schwab, contacted the center seeking legal assistance in obtaining admission to the Naval and Air Force Academies. Ms. Cross indicated that she had received a nomination from Congressman Jerome Waldie for an appointment to the Naval Academy. Ms. Schwab noted that she was seeking a nomination to the Air Force Academy from Congressman Don Edwards. Both stated that they had been informed by the respective academies that their applications for admission would not be processed for one reason alone—because they are women.

Accordingly, last September, a suit challenging the sex discriminatory admissions policies of the Naval and Air Force Academies was brought in the Federal District for the District of Columbia on behalf of several women and Congresspersons. The suit attacks the Academies' exclusionary policies as unconstitutional under the Equal Protection principles of the 14th amendment embodied in the 5th amendment due process clause.

The service academies have defended against the suit by arguing that the language of the statutes under which Congresspersons appoint limits attendance to men only, and that the purpose and mission of the Academies is to train persons for those combat positions set forth in 10 U.S.C., subsection 8549 and 10 U.S.C., subsection 6014, positions which those statutes preclude women from holding.

The plaintiffs pointed out to the district court that the terminology of the statutes under which Congresspersons appoint, for example, "midshipmen," "cadets," numerous references to male pronouns, and "sons" is similar to that which appears throughout the legislation governing ROTC programs. ROTC programs were opened to women without necessitating a statutory change, and accordingly for the academies to argue that in one statute it means men only, but in another it means men and women is contradictory. It was further pointed out that principles of statutory construction would require that words and phrases of the male gender normally be read to include the female.

The district court concluded that there was nothing in the statutory provisions governing appointments to the academies to prevent the appointment of women. The district court did find, however, on the basis of affidavits submitted by the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Superintendents of the Air Force and Naval Academies that the purpose and mission of the academies is to train military officers for combat duty, and inasmuch as women are precluded by statute and policy from being assigned to active combat roles, limiting attendance at the academies to men only is rationally related to the statutes and policies.

The district court noted that the plaintiffs have not challenged the constitutionality of the statutes precluding women from serving on aircraft assigned to a combat mission or from naval ships other than transport or hospital ships, namely 10 U.S.C., subsection 6015 and 10 U.S.C., subsection 8549.

Plaintiffs believe that without challenging those statutes, women have a constitutional right to an academy education. The mission and purpose of the academies, as stated in the legislation governing them and the recruiting catalogues and brochures they publish, and the education and training actually provided at the academies is the training of military officers, not the training of military officers for those combat roles precluded by statute to women.

It is well documented that an academy education provides a person with four times the professional training of any other officer accession program. It is equally well documented that academy graduates receive promotion and advantageous placements in higher percentages than other officers in the services. Accordingly, women who serve in all services as military officers, and who the services are not recruiting in large numbers in the hopes of quadrupling the total number of women by 1977, have as much of a constitutional right as any man to an academy education.

The Naval Academy lays great stress on the fact that women cannot by statute serve on combat vessels. The Academy argues that some Academy training occurs on combat vessels, and that at one time or another most naval officers serve on board a naval vessel. To begin with, the statutes preclude serving, not training on board combat ships. In addition, there is at least one ship, the S.S. *Sanctuary*, on which women do serve as commissioned officers, and on and off of which junior officers could rotate for training and service. In addition, at least as to training on combatant ships while at the Naval Academy, not all midshipmen spend one or more summers aboard a combatant vessel. Each year there are at least 20 men who spend their summer aboard one or more sailing yachts training to compete in the Bermuda and Norfolk races. Certainly there is no statute or custom which would preclude women from serving thereon.

As to the Air Force Academy, and the argument that women are precluded from serving as pilot, navigator, or missile control operator, those positions are the only three which the Air Force has closed to women. Each year hundreds of the officers graduating from the Air Force Academy enter other specialties which are open to women. This committee is already aware that a substantial portion of those entering the Air Force Academy, namely 30 percent of the class, may have physical disabilities which render them ineligible for those positions which are closed by statute to women. Thus, certainly as to that 30 percent of the class, a woman has as much of a constitutional right as a man to compete for appointments to the Academy.

A number of times throughout these hearings, the academies have urged that if this committee enacts such legislation, that they be given time to make all the changes necessary for the admission of women, and to make certain that a sizable number be admitted at one time. They have made similar pleas to the courts.

The women, however, are not asking for any changes in curriculum or training, so at least to those aspects of the program no changes are needed. As to physical arrangements, some changes may be needed, but except for changing the plumbing at a few locations, the changes will be very few and ought to be able to be completed in a matter of a week or two. After all, each of the academies has or has had women on its faculty, and so some facilities are already available. As for the need of waiting until there is a sizable contingent available to enroll together, if a basic right exists, it exists from the moment it is recognized forward. To those women who seek a career in the military, it will not be any consolation to have an academy education denied them or postponed while awaiting the enrollment of some specific number.

Plaintiffs have taken an appeal from the decision of the district court and requested expedited treatment. The court of appeals has ordered that the case be argued at the outset of its first sitting in September. While predictions on when a decision could be forthcoming from the appellate court can only be that, one member of the court indicated he hoped the matter could be decided by December.

It might be of interest to members of this committee that one of the first questions asked by the court of appeals was the status of these hearings and the legislation under consideration. I recall in one of the first sessions of this committee's hearings a similar question being raised, followed by the conjecture that legislation might be unnecessary since the court might be resolving the matter. I would urge this committee to continue with its hearings, and to favorably report out the legislation it is now considering. The timetable of the courts will be unpredictable. Whether the courts or this committee act first is immaterial. What is important is that there be a minimization of delays in the time when women begin receiving the valuable professional, military, educational and training opportunities now available to men only.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Thank you, Ms. Dondy.

Could you, for the benefit of the subcommittee, expand on your statement that women are not asking for any changes in curriculum or training? Do you include in that statement the physical training that is required at the academy?

Ms. **Dondy**. That is correct.

Mr. **Nedzi**. The same rigorous physical standards are to be maintained, as far as you are concerned?

Ms. **Dondy**. That is correct.

Mr. **Nedzi**. What about the question of roommates; are rooms to be assigned without any regard for whether the individual is male or female?

Ms. **Dondy**. I would expect that to be a decision of the academy itself. I think on most college campuses today they are assigned with some regard to sex. There may be some changes in that but it is my understanding that most of the room arrangements——

Mr. **Nedzi**. Tell us what you would like to see.

Ms. **Dondy**. I would think it would be up to the individual preference of those at the academies. My understanding is that the preference would be for women to be with women and men to be with men.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Would you require the Academies to segregate in this regard?

Ms. **Dondy**. I again think it would be their decision as to how they want to handle it.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Suppose you were the superintendent at the Naval Academy. Would you have any requirement of separate rooms, or each one picks for himself?

Ms. **Dondy**. Each one picks for himself.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Any questions?

Ms. **Dondy**. Or herself.

Mr. **Dickinson**. I have a couple questions. We have had some witnesses express a strong feeling that if the law should be changed and women admitted to the Academies, there, too, should be a change in the law to abolish the restrictions on where they might serve so that they would be able to serve in combat roles the same as men—with absolutely no difference. Would you subscribe to this?

Ms. **Dondy**. It is my belief that the Academies can begin admitting women this very moment without having to make that change. That change will be forthcoming under the equal rights amendment, if not sooner. The legislation however should be changed.

Mr. **Dickinson**. What I was asking you, do you support this philosophy that there should be a change in the law?

Ms. **Dondy**. Yes, I do support such a change. But without even reaching that issue the first can be reached.

Mr. **Dickinson**. One thing that bothers me personally in trying to arrive at a decision was the testimony we received from the Naval Academy that approximately 40 percent or 50 percent of all training goes toward service aboard vessels. Do you remember, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. **Hogan**. Forty percent.

Mr. **Dickinson**. About 40 percent of the total curriculum in the Naval Academy is devoted to training for service aboard combat vessels, navigation, ballistics, or any number of things that are peculiar to the Navy and service aboard the vessels.

If you do not do away with the distinction so women are allowed to serve on combat vessels, then 40 percent of all of the training they get is really of use to no one, and particularly the female cadet, midshipperson, because she won't be able to serve on board ship. That is one of the things that the Navy feels would be a terrible waste if you didn't change the curriculum.

Until the law is changed, it would be a nullity, a futile thing, because they cannot benefit from the training. What would be your comment on this?

Ms. Dondy. I am not sure it is as great a waste as they picture it to be. Sixty-five——

Mr. Dickinson. What do you think this 40 percent should be devoted to if they cannot do it?

Ms. Dondy. Sixty-five percent of the Navy at any one time is not serving on board ship. If you are going to make the argument as to women, you must make it as to 65 percent of the men also on land who have received training to be at sea and are not being utilized at sea. Apart from that, there may be some waste but there is a great deal of training that goes on throughout a person's career which one is not specifically utilizing at any one particular point.

Mr. Dickinson. You are missing the point I am trying to make. The law specifically prohibits her serving in duties for which 40 percent of the time learning is devoted. That was my point, not the fact that some do and some don't. They are prohibited by law from doing that. I want to know what your comment on that was.

Abolish the law first, let them go in and take training in courses that they cannot use, or how do you approach that?

Ms. Dondy. First of all, they can serve on board any hospital ship in the Navy. Admittedly, that is not a combat vessel. There are a lot of vessels in the Navy which have one gun on them which in the Navy's classification is a combat vessel and accordingly one from which women are barred from serving. Women could serve on those. Women can also train on any vessel; training is different from serving.

That aside, yes, the law should be changed. But admission of women to the Academy does not have to await that change in the law.

Mr. Dickinson. I have no further questions.

Mr. Nedzi. Mr. Daniel.

Mr. Daniel. To follow that question, Mr. Chairman—

Would you find total equality, that is, sharing dormitories, showers, physical training program, et cetera, an acceptable way to admit women to the Academies?

Ms. Gates. I am rather concerned about the committee's concern with bathrooms and bedrooms because I sat through years of discussion on the Equal Rights Amendment, in which practically all of the interest of the committee addressing itself to that problem is directed toward bathrooms and bedrooms, which seems to me a little off the point.

Mr. Daniel. There are no lady latrines in the gunboats. That is where combat is conducted most of the time.

Ms. Gates. There are no——

Mr. Daniel. Would you respond to the question?

Ms. GATES. There are no latrines in the situation you describe. What I am trying to suggest to you is that there are schools around this country which have become coeducational and which also did not have male-female facilities.

Mr. DANIEL. Those schools are not training people in combat; they are strictly educational institutions.

Ms. GATES. There are also women who are serving in combat areas now, nurses and people whose personal needs have been met in one way or the other. I guess what I was trying to say is that there is a basic right of privacy, which I think is what is concerned in the question of bedrooms and bathrooms, which has to be respected. I don't think we want to go on record talking about drastically changing people's life styles or how they care for their personal needs. I think that those problems have been met in other contexts and they can be met in this context.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that all you desire to say about the question? You don't desire to respond to the question directly?

Ms. GATES. Perhaps I didn't understand your question. I thought I was responding to it.

Mr. DANIEL. Would you find total equality, that is, sharing dormitories, showers, physical training programs, et cetera, an acceptable way to admit women into the Academies?

Ms. GATES. I think the physical training programs should be shared. I think that there is a right to privacy involved in bedrooms and bathrooms.

Mr. DANIEL. What is your position with respect to the draft? If the volunteer Army fails to produce a sufficient number of qualified men—fails to meet military requirements, will you support selective service legislation which includes drafting of females for combat purposes?

Ms. GATES. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. On page 3, this follows up the question propounded by Mr. Dickinson, you talk about the purpose of the Academies to train military officers for combat, and so forth. Further on, you talk in the next paragraph about the "* * * plaintiffs have not challenged the constitutionality of the statutes precluding women from serving on aircraft assigned to a combat mission * * *". What is the logic behind challenging of provisions that only men may attend the service academies while remaining neutral to the constitutionality of combat assignments?

Mr. MARTIN. If I can speak to that, of the military academy class part of the military academy class trains to become Air Force pilots. That is, they will take part in missions, combat missions. The major part of the Academy class will volunteer because they are physically qualified in service to engage in the combat area, become specialists in a nonrated or noncombat available specialty in the Air Force. In other words, something like 200 people last year graduating from the Academy became scientists, computer technologists, weathermen, intelligence experts, et cetera.

Mr. DANIEL. That is not responding to the question.

Mr. MARTIN. What I am suggesting, if I can go on just a second, is that there is a place for these women to go in the Academy and perform a function, even apart from a combat function. The Academy trains people to perform noncombat functions and women have a place there.

Mr. **Daniel.** Mr. Chairman, I came to these committee meetings initially expecting to vote for this legislation. I find the testimony generally we have received totally illogical and I am almost turned off by it. That is all.

Mr. **Nedzi.** Mrs. Holt.

Mrs. **Holt.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am not ready to commit us to combat yet, but I think the definition of combat should be reconsidered. I think it has changed completely today. I wonder how you feel about developing a two-track system in the Academies to recognize the physical differences in women in combat? Do you think that would satisfy the rights of women? It would give them the opportunity to advance in the military, to have the training, and yet would not commit them to actual combat.

Ms. **Dondy.** My problem with that position is that I am not sure there are that many differences with women that would warrant or would support a distinction of any sort. I have not seen anything—in fact, everything I have seen to date that has come out in reports about the physical ability and mental abilities of women indicates to the contrary. Women are as able as men to do almost anything.

Mrs. **Holt.** I don't question that at all. I do think that there are structural differences. I get quoted every time I say we are childbearers, but I am very proud of it and I think it is a real privilege and a real honor. I think we have to take that into consideration. We do have physical differences, and I wondered how you felt about whether this two-track system would work.

Ms. **Dondy.** I realize this may be something that Congress may decide to do, it may be the way they resolve the problem. My personal preference would be to see it resolved so that women are given a full equal opportunity.

Mrs. **Holt.** Thank you.

Mr. **Dickinson.** Would you yield?

I take it from that you feel in anything other than this present system they would be denied full equal opportunity, such as if the two-track system were instituted?

Ms. **Dondy.** I do, yes.

Mr. **Nedzi.** Mr. Montgomery.

Mr. **Montgomery.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to address my question, if I may, to Ms. or Mrs. Dondy. Some of the stronger testimony given against this legislation in my opinion was given by the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Callaway, where he pointed out that with a large percentage of West Point graduates, larger than Reserve or otherwise getting commissions, history has proven they are in combat more than other officer groups and you have more casualties. He was concerned, and I think it is a legitimate point, whether men will follow a female officer in combat. I know this is a tough question, but this is a concern of mine and I wish you would address yourself to answering this question. Do you think that women can lead men in combat? This is what it is all about.

Ms. **Dondy.** I have talked with a number of people in the military over the last few months and it is my impression from talking with every single man I talked with that if the woman were able and qualified, they would be more than willing to have that woman command them. She would simply be another person commanding them and there would be no regard to sex. They have indicated there are occasions in which they think there are women presently in the service who are in fact better qualified than some of the men serving in those positions and who in fact should be commanding.

I would think a man could accept the command of a woman. Women have accepted the command of men over the years. Yes.

Mrs. Holt. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. Montgomery. Glad to.

Mrs. Holt. Mrs. Meier got her war over in 6 days, and some of the gentlemen don't do it that quickly.

Mr. Montgomery. Thank you, Mrs. Holt.

Mr. Callaway pointed out that going down to the infantry platoon level, probably men would have, in effect, a protective feeling for them. If she is a lieutenant, they would be trying to protect her more than trying to follow her. Do you care to comment on this?

Ms. Dondy. I think that these may be basic instincts people have today in the light of our customs and the way we have conducted ourselves over the past years. I think that as women begin to do all of the things in the services that men do and begin to take an equal role, those distinctions will no longer exist. We certainly are grateful to you for the protectiveness that you feel toward us, but we can do without it. We prefer to have equal opportunities.

Mr. Montgomery. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I have had some good, strong feelings over the years and I don't know what kind of effect this is going to have on me.

Mr. Nedzi. Let the record show Mr. Montgomery is still a bachelor.

Ms. Dondy. Ms. Gates has something to say in response to the question.

Ms. Gates. I want to suggest to you that there has been some interesting evaluation work done on women police, which is another area that presents the kind of problems that I think you were speaking of. The Police Foundation in Washington has done an evaluation report in which considerations of the question of women, men following women and working together in dangerous situations, has been addressed. I would be glad to supply that to you. [Not supplied.]

Mr. Nedzi. Mr. Hillis.

Mr. Hillis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Many of my questions have already been asked and received answers. But first I want to thank you for coming here this morning. I think this is a very important question. All of the facts on all sides should be aired and considered by the committee. I don't find myself in full agreement with you. However, I would like to ask you, do you envision as equal opportunity, first of all, that all MOS assignments be open to women regardless?

Ms. Dondy. Yes, sir.

Mr. Hillis. Do you envision that in future service for the country in the armed services these MOS's and roles might be manned equally, 50–50. As you see the future of the military services in this country, is it going to be predominantly male or 50–50, or could it become predominantly female?

Ms. Dondy. According to qualifications, those best qualified to fill the MOS. As long as there is no overt discrimination, either for or against one or the other.

Mr. **Hillis**. You are saying perhaps in the future enrollment the Academy might become half and half?

Ms. **Dondy**. It could. Or it could be predominantly one or the other. If more women at any one time are more qualified than men, then the female sex might predominate.

Mr. **Hillis**. I take it you are saying whatever the position, whether combat rifleman, one should be permitted to handle it if they chose to do so?

Ms. **Dondy**. That is correct.

Mr. **Hillis**. Did I understand you to say women who could be drafted to serve in these positions should be drafted?

Ms. **Dondy**. I think if we go back to a draft, that will be a foregone conclusion. And if we have another war, every person will probably be serving.

Mr. **Hillis**. In all MOS assignments?

Ms. **Dondy**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Hillis**. That is all. Thank you.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. **Wilson**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

May I say that I find myself in complete agreement with you, and different from my colleagues in that respect.

I found in the hearings held to date great inconsistencies in the testimony received from those who were in opposition to allow women to attend the Academies.

We have a law that says women cannot be in combat in the Air Force and Navy. We don't have a law that says this is true for the Army. On this MOS business, people are not assigned MOS's according to what they want to be assigned to. They are assigned to what they are qualified for. All men are not qualified for every MOS. In the various military services I think we have been doing a lot of nitpicking so far as facilities and physical qualifications are concerned. The same with exercises, and that type of thing, so far as women and men are concerned. I don't think anyone visualizes that you will have an identical situation for all individuals. Again, I say that it is considerably different for the men, as Admiral Mack stated. He is Superintendent of the Naval Academy. All men are not qualified to enter the Naval Academy.

It seems to me we have a lot of hangups that perhaps we should attempt to eliminate. I don't have any questions. I want to commend you upon your statement and the position you have taken in coming to appear before our committee.

I have introduced legislation which would abolish the noncombat requirement for women so that women can be free to enter the Air Force and Naval Academies. This is a ridiculous thing that there is absolutely no reason for. We have had war correspondents in the jungles and they had no difficulties alongside men. We have had women reporters and nurses, as you brought out. There have been any number of cases where women have been able to go alongside men and do as much as the men have been able to do.

On combat roles or in combat situations, it seems to me that we are getting down to a very exclusive little country club type of thing, where you have an $8,000 education available to men and women as well as the $20,000 scholarship officer preparatory training in the ROTC but only as guests of this exclusive academy thing established for men only. It happens that way. I think this has to be changed and the same opportunities available to all people in this country of ours, particularly when we are making them available to foreigners who are not going to defend the United States in the event of national emergency.

Mr. **Daniel**. Would the gentleman yield?

I wonder if your organization has made any studies to determine how many women might be interested in attending the Academies in the event policy is changed?

Ms. **Dondy**. Only at the outset of the litigation did we try and poll Congresspersons to try to find out how many women had indicated an interest in applying for an appointment for a nomination. It was my impression that over half of all Congresspersons were polled, and almost everyone of them indicated that they had had women in the past year or two express an interest. We, however, did not come up with any total number of women who would either be interested and/or qualified.

Mr. **Daniel**. Do you have any personal feeling about how many you think might apply if made available?

Ms. **Dondy**. I think probably a great number would apply. As with men, they must be qualified, and I have no idea as to how many would actually qualify.

Mr. **Daniel**. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Wilson**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Ms. Dondy, I think it is fair to say that all of us are seeking to do equity and do what is right, not only on this issue but all issues.

Are you concerned at all that because of the difference in physical characteristics—and I am talking about strength, size, ability to do x number of pushups or pullups—if the physical standards, physical aptitude standards remain the same for men and women, there is in fact inequity?

Ms. **Dondy**. It depends on the logic of the physical requirements. If the physical requirements are rational related to the needs of the military, then I think men and women must meet those qualifications. If there is no rational basis for having certain physical requirements, then, no. I can see having differences. But it is my impression that most physical aptitude examinations, women can meet the same standards as men if they are trained to the same level.

Mr. **Nedzi**. On the average?

Ms. **Dondy**. We are not talking about average people. We are talking about very physically fit people.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Is it your impression we will have an equal number of women candidates satisfy the physical requirements of the Academies as men?

Ms. **Dondy**. No, I don't think we will have an equal number of women and men physically qualified because I don't think as many women at this point in time are as physically able as men. That does not mean with training and everything else they can not be and won't be. I think women are quite catching up with men. Equal physical education programs in high schools and junior high schools are making this possible. If you examine Olympic teams you find the women perform as physically able as men on the team.

Mr. **Nedzi**. My only point is that in effect when you have physical aptitude standards in the military right now, you are expecting the same out of a segment of the population whose physical characteristics are obviously not on the average up to the physical characteristics of men.

Ms. **Dondy**. If they are not on the average up to those men, we are still only talking about those physical requirements needed to do the job.

Mr. **Nedzi**. You don't feel that maintaining the present standards is really inequitable?

Ms. **Dondy**. Not if the present standards are really normally related to the needs of the Academy. I have not examined the present standards. Presumably there is some rhyme or reason for this existence. I would expect the physical requirements to be related to the educational and training needs of the Academy; requirements which contribute to producing the most able people. If this is the case, then I would think women would have to meet the physical requirements the same as a man.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Am I correct in sensing in your response that the present standards are not necessary?

Ms. **Dondy**. No. I really have not gone over the physical requirements that carefully with a view to whether or not they are or not necessary. I am saying that if they should not be necessary, then whatever is the necessary requirement that both men and women should have to meet those.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. **Dickinson**. If you will yield for one question. I think Ms. Dondy would be interested in this.

Recently the Army Aviation Center graduated its first woman helicopter pilot. Her name I think is Murphy. I was on an interview program with her not too long ago and asked her this question because of her size and the fact she was a woman. Did it militate against her in any way going through the program and the training in her meeting the same set of standards as men. Her reply was that, yes, she had difficulty in preflight checks, and so forth, since she was not as tall as most men. She couldn't perform some of the things as well because she was more limited as far as her ability to perform in the aircraft. But it did not bother her, nor would it bother her, to compete on the same standards as did the men.

We now have three or four women presently in training to be aircraft pilots. I do think there are other areas of endeavor in the military where size and strength are important and where women can not compete as effectively simply because of this and not because of anything written in the rules or regulations.

Ms. **Dondy**. It may be, but there are women of all sizes, shapes, as there are men, and I am sure there would be some who would be qualified.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Thank you.

Mr. **Wilson**. Mr. Chairman, every year it seems to me they have updated physical requirements and educational requirements, everything, at the Academies. It seems to me it is not unreasonable if the decision is made that women should be allowed to go to the Academies they might adjust the physical requirements if some of them are more stringent than what they should be. They do it now for football players or other people in order to get them into the Academies. There is a special reason for admitting particular people. I see no reason why this should be a reason alone why we should deny women the right to go to Academies. I think we can adjust the physical standards. We are going to have a witness coming up here that might be able to tell us about the ability of women, Colonel King, who is scheduled to appear this morning. She is quite experienced in telling what the role of women can be if properly utilized.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nedzi. Mr. Hogan.

Mr. Hogan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Dondy, I gather that you have no quarrel with the constitutionality of the statutes which prohibit women from engaging in combat?

Ms. Dondy. Yes, I do have problems with the statute.

Mr. Hogan. What problems? You didn't challenge them in the——

Ms. Dondy. We didn't find it necessary for purposes of our suit, and we didn't find it necessary for the purposes of this legislation for getting some women into the Academies. For making sure that women have equal opportunity to all opportunities at the Academies, yes, that legislation would have to be challenged.

Mr. Hogan. You consider it to be unconstitutional?

Ms. Dondy. Yes, I do. I would think the legislation would automatically fall under the passage of the equal rights amendment.

Mr. Hogan. You have indicated the Academies provide four times the professional training of any other officer program. Where did you get your information?

Ms. Dondy. From the Academies themselves and the affidavits they submitted both in our lawsuit and to this committee.

Mr. Hogan. You also indicate there is a higher percentage of promotion placement. Is that based solely on professional ability or is it somehow in your opinion based partially on discrimination?

Ms. Dondy. I think there is discrimination in favor of Academy graduates within the services. Is that responsive to your question?

Mr. Hogan. Yes.

Where do you get that information?

Ms. Dondy. There have been studies that go back to the 1950's that I would be glad to furnish this committee which show the rapid promotion of Academy graduates and the percentages of Academy graduates that hold the higher positions in the services. In response to interrogatories not provided by plaintiffs in her lawsuit the Air Force gave us statistics showing this to be true. The Navy failed to respond to our interrogatories. But going on evidence as recent as perhaps 1961, published studies, that was a fact, and we have not seen anything to the contrary to contradict it.

Mr. Hogan. How do those figures support discrimination? Where do you get that information?

Ms. Dondy. The evidence shows a greater percentage of Academy graduates becoming higher commissioned officers and receiving promotions more quickly. That is all. From that information we draw the conclusion that there is subtle or not so subtle discrimination in favor of Academy graduates.

Mr. Hogan. What is to say that is not based solely upon ability?

Ms. Dondy. There is nothing to say it is not based solely upon ability.

Mr. Hogan. That is conjecture on your part?

Ms. Dondy. Yes, on the part of a number of sociologists who have studied the matter.

Mr. Hogan. We have heard very little of the interest of women going to West Point. How do you account for that?

Ms. Dondy. When we started out we were only approached by a woman who was interested in going to the Air Force Academy and one interested in going to the Naval Academy. After that time we were approached by women interested in West Point. The services themselves indicated that there was no necessity of joining West Point on the suit because if the courts opened appointments to women at the two Academies, they would presume the policy applied to West Point as well.

It has been my impression that there are a number of women who are interested in attending West Point. There were an equal number of applicants to each of the Academies—12 or 15 women—which shows an equal interest in the Academies among women.

Mr. Hogan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Daniel. Mr. Chairman.

We just had a demonstration of women's superiority over men. You responded, I thought, well to counsel's constitutional question. The gentleman may respond to mine.

Ms. Dondy. I apologize if any of us have failed to respond to anything.

Mr. Hillis. One other point I might ask at this juncture. Isn't it altogether possible that one of the reasons for the record of advancement of the Academy graduate in the military is probably the better training on the Academy level, better than ROTC or officer training; would you agree?

Ms. Dondy. Of course——

Mr. Hillis. We are calling more and more upon women to serve in various capacities in the service today, even though they are not combat prepared or trained for combat positions. It might be said that it could be considered discriminatory that women are not getting the best training. Would you comment?

Ms. Dondy. Clearly, women are not getting the best training available. They are not getting the best training available in ROTC programs. A woman cannot receive a 4-year scholarship in the Air Force because they only go to persons who qualify to be a pilot or navigator or missile control operator. The greatest scholarship a woman can receive in ROTC is a 2-year scholarship. Women are not receiving equal opportunities; no.

Mr. Hillis. In appointment into the Academies, they are not receiving equal opportunity there?

Ms. Dondy. Not at all; no.

Mr. Hillis. Thank you.

Mr. Nedzi. If there is nothing further, thank you very much.

Our next witness, representing Women's Lobby, Inc., Ms. Glenn Ellefson-Brooks.

Proceed.

STATEMENT OF MS. GLENN ELLEFSON-BROOKS, DIRECTOR, VETERANS AFFAIRS, WOMEN'S LOBBY, INC., ACCOMPANIED BY MS. CAROL BURRIS

Ms. Brooks. Ms. Carol Burris is present with me. She is president of the lobby.

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I am Glenn Ellefson-Brooks, director of veterans affairs for Women's Lobby, Inc. The lobby is a national organization with affiliates in 40 States. We work solely on legislation affecting women. I am a World War II veteran of the Women's Army Corps.

Women's Lobby supports all efforts to open the service academies to women. We are very concerned about equal justice for the young women of this country. The General Accounting Office estimates are that a cadet from the Air Force Academy cost $80,000, while Annapolis and West Point cost us about $60,000 each. We assume that includes dropout cost.

As of May 31, 1974, there were 3,744 men at the Air Force Academy. This means a cost to all of us of $299,520,000. On the same date there were 3,933 men at the Naval Academy, which costs us all $285,980,000. At the same time there were 3,789 men in West Point at a cost of $227,340,000. [Specific class information is in appendix I, see p. 225.]

Women are now 44 percent of the work force. Their median income is $5,593. This means that women taxpayers are paying almost half of the cost of the academies that they are unable to attend. This is $381,420,000 for something that I can never use.

When you consider my daughters, the discrimination becomes more painful, for I am paying additional Federal, State, and local taxes to support a college system that they can attend while bearing this enormous burden. Luckily, I can afford to pay the additional private costs of all these State universities. But the enormous potential for leadership in half our population goes untapped, as does the right of poor women to a superb education.

General Eisenhower wrote of the poverty of his home in Kansas, and the appeal of West Point because it was free. What Eisenhower is being denied entrance as we discuss this?

With the all-volunteer army, women are becoming an ever larger part of the service. By 1978, the goal is 140,000 women. They are being recruited into nontraditional jobs. The Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Military—DACOWITS—adopted a resolution for the Defense Department:

> Therefore DACOWITS recommends that, in anticipation of this eventuality, the armed services develop plans and be prepared to admit a minimum of one hundred (100) women to each of their respective academies.

So our discussion here is whether or not one-half of the population will give orders to the other half.

In the service, I saw the edge Academy men had in gaining command. Congresswoman Schroeder submitted in her testimony a chart showing the high proportion of Academy graduates as the grade rises. Are we forever to handicap young women so they can never command?

Let us be clear that patriotism is not a sex-linked characteristic. Barbara Fritchie or Joan of Arc were not hampered by their sex.

I was recently reading an interesting article about women that served in the Civil War in the Union Army. Due to the fact they didn't have the elaborate physical examination in those days they could enlist in the infantry, artillery, and if detected and discharged they simply went and enlisted in another outfit.

Some of the men on this committee served in the House when it voted to draft nurses in the Second World War. The war ended before the Senate passed the bill. If we were needed, we would all be called, for no country can defend itself without 52 percent of its population.

The discussion of women in combat seems to elicit some of the most patronizing statements I have ever heard. Such things as what we will let our women do, and the fact that you would be offending the dignity of womanhood to go into combat when it is held up as an honor for a man to be able to do that for his country. To me, this makes no sense at all.

As a veteran, let me make it clear that I love this country enough to serve in any capacity in which I am able. I have done so once and would do so again. Frankly, I am outraged at the suggestion of my place in the Army.

We at Women's Lobby would suggest that the academies are the leadership training grounds for all the services and to deny women access denies them a right to lead as well as taxing them without any representation in the use of those dollars.

Frankly, it should be pointed out that officers, particularly senior ones, serve behind the lines because that is where plans must be made. If we feared combat for women, perhaps we should promote them beyond that point.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. We hope you will move with dispatch on this legislation.

[Appendix I follows:]

APPENDIX I

May 31, 1974

	Class
Air Force Academy:	
812	1974
775	1975
1,023	1976
1,134	1977
Naval Academy:	
923	1974
828	1975
959	1976
1,223	1977
Army Academy:	
846	1974
871	1975
955	1976
1,117	1977

SOURCE.—Women Workers Today, Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Ms. BROOKS. My personal feeling is any women choosing a career in the military and who prefers academy training and is willing to accept the risks being liable for combat duty, who successfully completes the mental and physical entrance requirements, must have an opportunity with her brother to be appointed. It is just a matter of simple justice.

We hope that you will move with it.

That concludes my testimony.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Are there any questions?

Mr. **Wilson**. We thank you for your appearance here. I think you are doing a fine job and we appreciate the statement you have just made. I know you follow these hearings and are very concerned with the subject matter before us.

Ms. **Brooks**. May I make one comment that I think has been overlooked at times?

I have two daughters and one son. I have had people say, "You wouldn't want your daughters to go into combat, would you?"

My logical answer to that is no, of course I wouldn't, but neither would I want my son to. I can't make a distinction between any of those three children where I would say, "Well, if one has to go, it had better be the boy."

I simply cannot do that as a mother. I feel if the time ever comes when in the case of nuclear attack, or World War III and this sort of thing, it really isn't going to matter whether you are in or out of the service.

We are all going to be called to do our share. I would want every one of them to do it.

Mr. **Wilson**. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good point. General Weyand commented he wasn't prepared to have his daughter go into combat. Other military people who have been here have made the same comment.

I don't believe it is their place to judge this legislation on the basis of what they want for their own daughters.

Many fathers and mothers have an entirely different opinion. As you say, you don't want your sons to go into combat either but I don't think a military officer should be the judge based on his own personal opinions about his own children.

I know we are all inclined to think of this on a personal basis, but I hope that is not something which will determine what the committee does.

Mr. **Hogan**. When Mr. Martin was testifying, he used interchangeably the term nonrated and noncombat. They are not interchangeable. Many nonrated people go into combat so I think the record should be clear on that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Thank you Ms. Brooks.

STATEMENT OF LT. COL. GRACE M. KING, U.S. ARMY RESERVE

Ms. **King**. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: thank you for the opportunity of presenting testimony on behalf of the admission of women to the service academies.

Having attended the three previous hearings, I was reminded of a sign on the bulletin board of a Reserve training center in Connecticut. It was titled, "How to kill ideas", and listed beneath were the following statements: "It's too radical a change", "You're two years ahead of your time", "We're not ready for that yet", and "It costs too much".

All of these "killers" have been used at one time or another during the previous testimony.

It is tempting to reply in kind to the hypothetical fantasies indulged in during these hearings but I believe that Representatives elected to Congress would prefer more facts and less fantasy in deciding a serious issue.

It is a fact that the service academies are the only institutions of higher learning completely devoted to total professional military training. I stress the word "professional," for that is the difference between the Academies and ROTC. A member of ROTC is not studying to become a professional soldier. His or her membership in ROTC is in addition to the intended career for which he or she is preparing. As stated by General Clark in his testimony before this subcommittee, "there's a great deal of difference in the product of ROTC and the product of the Academy." The issue is not that of "injecting" women into combat or forcing your daughters to bear arms—it is a matter of permitting women the same freedom of choice as men to plan their own lives and careers—in this case, a professional military career. If risk is involved, isn't that the right of the individual to assume for herself? We are talking about a voluntary course of action, not compulsory force. Relatively few women will choose the military—relatively few men do. But to deny this opportunity simply based on sex is to deny a pool of talent and intelligence more critically needed than ever in an all-volunteer environment.

The alternative educational programs for officers are as available to men as they are to women and under the quota system, even more so. If these programs are used as an excuse to exclude women from the Academies, then the same reasoning must apply to men. What has really been said by representatives of the three services is, ROTC and OCS are good enough for women but not good enough for men.

The commandants have stated repeatedly that those who attend the service academies receive at least 50 percent more military training than do students in ROTC or OCS. Vice Admiral Mack in his testimony declared, "the Naval Academy provides a cadet with four times the amount of professional training received by naval officers in other officer accession programs * * *" Academy graduates are increasingly favored over other officers when it comes to promotion and placement with the services. For example, the most recent Army promotion lists reveal that 32 percent of the newly appointed brigadier generals are graduates of the U.S. Military Academy. In contrast, only 9 percent of commissioned officers in the Army are West Point graduates. A larger percentage of Academy graduates get the opportunity to attend the senior Army colleges than is true for officers who were not trained at West Point. Similarly, the Naval Academy is the largest single source of new lieutenant commanders, supplying twice as many of the selectees for that position as any other source although only a fraction of commissioned naval officers are from Annapolis. Thus, the denial to qualified women of the opportunity to attend the academies severely disadvantages them in the competition later on for promotions and advantageous placement.

Cost effectiveness is an object of great concern, the implication being that female graduates will marry, become pregnant, and as put by Lieutenant General Clark, "melt away to pursue more normal female objectives" which he indicated was the situation concerning the highly qualified group of female pilots who constituted the WASP's of World War II. I submit that the facts do not support General Clark's statement. I have included a "Summary of the WASP Controversy" in the folder of facts presented to each member of this subcommittee. In short, this "highly qualified" group of 800 was forced out by the Army Air Force which had by then built up its male complement and by congressional action which abolished the WASP in December 1944. Given the alternative of joining the WAC with the knowledge that they would not be assigned as pilots nor allowed flying duty of any sort, they did indeed choose to melt away, but only after waging and losing a bitter battle for survival.

Since women are denied the opportunity of attending the Academies we may only speculate on their retention rate. On the other hand, the Secretary of the Army himself presents a factual male example. Graduating from West Point in 1949, Lieutenant Callaway served briefly in Korea, returning home after a few months to be with his wife who was expecting a difficult delivery. Fortunately, all went well but Lieutenant Callaway did not return to Korea. He served out his time at Fort Benning as an instructor, resigning his commission in December 1952.

I see no reason why any female officer who becomes pregnant could not follow this same pattern with no more nor less impact upon the combat mission nor any difference in the cost effectiveness involved.

The Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy expressed a fear that the dropout rate among women will be higher than that among men. It should be noted that the dropout rate in March of this year reached 30 percent. This is the highest dropout rate since 1900 and may be the highest in the Academy's history. It is difficult to see how the addition of highly motivated young women would further worsen the overall dropout rate. I rather suspect it will result in an improvement of the retention rate.

In a related matter, the Superintendent seems worried about the complications that would result from establishing a separate less physically demanding program for women. A separate program is most emphatically not desirable. Female cadets must experience the full training the Academy offers, and they must experience it alongside the male cadets. A woman, like a man, should enter the Academy only if she is able and willing to meet the full challenge of the West Point program. This is equally true of Annapolis and the Air Force Academy. Vice Admiral Mack, alone among the Superintendents, understood this when he voiced objection to a two-track system as destroying the very program women were seeking.

The will of the American people has been a popular catchphrase throughout these hearings. But when asked how this was determined, the Defense Department counsel testified it was not based on any sort of survey but rather a "sensing of national attitudes." Why, on an issue of such vital interest to all the services involved has no one asked rather than sensed? I have been asking for 2 years and the answers received are perhaps an indication of why DOD prefers to make assumptions rather than test a hypothesis. Of 540 civilian and military men and women surveyed to date, 80 percent favor admitting women to the academies, while 73 percent believe women should be allowed to volunteer for combat training and combat duty. It is interesting to note that of the 54 questionnaires returned by members of the Armed Services Committee and their staffs, 88.8 percent favor admitting women to the academies and 81.4 percent favor allowing women to volunteer for combat. [Detailed description and survey results are included in the folder of facts.]

Lieutenant General Clark referred to the members of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services as one of the most influential and respected groups of women available in this country. I wholeheartedly agree and would like to add that at its spring meeting in Washington this year DACOWITS took a firm stand in favor of sending women to the service academies and advised the services to develop plans to admit at least 100 women to each of the academies.

A considerable amount of testimony has been offered to cast doubts on the ability of young women to serve on a par with their male counterparts. Again, Vice Admiral Mack was the singular exception, maintaining that women could go through the program, do it well, and serve in any role in the Navy if the restriction against women serving aboard combat vessels were rescinded. Although his was a lone voice at the hearings, he is far from alone among prestigious leaders of the military:

> General John C. Meyer, who heads the Strategic Air Command and is the Air Force's top fighter ace on active duty says, "Physically, intellectually, and emotionally, I cannot see any reason why some women can't be first-rate fighter pilots".
>
> Former Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird stated, "a lot of women are good aviators—why shouldn't a woman be a jet fighter pilot"?
>
> Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt Jr., recently retired Chief of Naval Operations, when asked what might be the "most logical billets" for women replied, "any job which a man now holds".
>
> Twenty-six years ago, before another subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower testified, "Like most old soldiers I was violently against women soldiers. I thought a tremendous number of difficulties would occur, not only of an administrative nature * * * but others of a more personal type that would get us into trouble. None of that occurred. * * * In the disciplinary field they were a model for the Army. More than this their influence throughout the entire command was good. I am convinced that in another war they have got to be drafted just like the men."

Today, 26 years later, we are still trying to convince "old soldiers who are violently against women soldiers."

In the questionnaires returned by members of the Armed Services Committee and their staffs, the overwhelming majority chose "demonstrated capabilities" as having the most influence on their attitude toward the role of women. The second most influential choice was "a sense of justice and fairplay."

We ask that you exercise this sense of justice and fairplay by enabling women the full opportunity to demonstrate their capabilities.

I have stated my position regarding the admission of women to the service academies and will be happy to answer any questions I am able to concerning this subject.

Mr. NEDZI. Thank you, Colonel. On page 8 you mention questionnaires returned by members of the Armed Services and their staffs. How many were returned?

Ms. KING. I sent five questionnaires to each member of the Armed Services Committee, one hopefully for the Congressman and four for his staff, so there would be no question from whom the returns came. It would be completely anonymous. I received 54 replies. As

I say, I have no idea which members sent them. All I know is they came from the Armed Services Committee and the staff—44—members.

Mr. **Nedzi**. How many were returned?

Ms. **King**. Fifty-four. Five went to each of the members.

Mr. **Nedzi**. I would like to know for my personal information, you don't know whether the responses were from staff members or from members themselves?

Ms. **King**. That is correct. Except in the instances where they put occupation—congressman, congresswoman.

Mr. **Nedzi**. How many of those did you have?

Ms. **King**. Four where it was stated.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Is it your position that there is no requirement for changing the physical qualifications for admission to the academies?

Ms. **King**. I think an example of that would be the airborne qualification requirements that they now have.

For instance, women do 50 knee bends, men do 80. Women run the mile in 9½ minutes. Men run it in 7½. Instead of doing pullups, women do what they call the shoulder press, which is lifting a 36-pound weight from the shoulders overhead and repeating back six times. Instead of that men do the pullups.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Are you advocating then that similar changes be made with respect to the physical qualifications required for admission to the academies?

Ms. **King**. If actual physical structure requires it to that degree, yes.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Do you know of any examples where it does?

Ms. **King**. I am not sure about the muscular structure as far as pullups go. I know in the airborne program by the time they reach the end of the program the men and the women run the mile in the same number of minutes, so they are brought together, but the qualification to enter training is different in the beginning.

Mr. **Nedzi**. I must say I have been impressed with the position that there is no present requirement for changing the physical qualifications in that both sexes be admitted equally across the board. I think there is a good deal of logic and substance to that kind of position. I am troubled if we get into the two-track system as others are. Where do you stand on the two-track as opposed to equality straight across the board?

Ms. **King**. I can see no possibility of a two-track system because you do not have the same institution any more; you have a women's auxiliary. I think we have been auxiliary long enough. We don't need it.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Is that inconsistent with a different requirement for admitting people in the airborne program?

Ms. **King**. I think it is, yes.

Mr. **Dickinson**. I would like to commend you on your statement which I thought was very good, very factual, and to the point. I would also like to comment on your own personal résumé and background in the military which is impressive.

Did you find the fact that you were a woman in the military a very serious disadvantage?

Ms. **King**. In what way?

Mr. **Dickinson.** In advancement.

Ms. **King.** Definitely.

Mr. **Dickinson.** You felt that you weren't able to compete on an equal basis with your contemporaries?

Ms. **King.** I wasn't allowed to compete on an equal basis.

Mr. **Dickinson.** You made lieutenant colonel so I guess you had to compete with somebody.

Ms. **King.** We also have a one-star general, but I don't think that is equivalent.

Mr. **Dickinson.** Perhaps it isn't and that is the reason I am asking you. The entire military system of advancement is a system of competition, isn't it? You are rated with your peers and contemporaries. Some make it and some don't and this goes up with every step. I assume you have some degree of competition with your contemporaries and I was wondering to what extent, if any, you found the fact of being a woman to be a handicap or a disadvantage in your advancement in your total military career.

Ms. **King.** Certainly it is a disadvantage, no question about it. You are restricted to the types of arms you can be in, you cannot be in the main arms of the Army—infantry, artillery, armor. This is very important when it comes to promotion. If you will look at the General's list, I am sure you will find very few who are adjutants or from the AG Corps, transportation, or anything else. They are mainly infantry, armor, artillery, and then engineers, on down.

For instance, in the ARCOM where I recently served, the next step would be to full colonel. There are seven full colonel slots; of those seven, four require that you have a backgroud in either infantry, artillery, or armor. You must be from one of those three branches even though they are staff jobs not requiring any combat function. Therefore, a woman has three chances out of seven to get promoted to a colonel and a man has seven out of seven. Yes indeed, there is a great difference.

Mr. **Dickinson.** This actually has nothing to do with the Academy, but my question had to do with the military in general. I assume you would be a strong advocate for doing away with all distinctions in all MOSs and AFSCs.

Ms. **King.** Absolutely.

Mr. **Dickinson.** As to the two-track system, I haven't made up my mind on the total question, but I am inclined to agree with you 100 percent that this would be impractical and further defeat its own purpose. If we go to a two-track system. I think if you have a noncombat role, or a noncombat educational track, as compared to the combat, then inevitably you are going to have males suing for their equal rights so that they can get in noncombat training.

So I think that you and those of you who advocate a one-track, one training across the board for both sexes, are on the right road.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. **Nedzi.** Mr. Daniel.

Mr. **Daniel.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to commend the Colonel for her services and thank her for it.

Colonel, would you differentiate between the Academies with respect to the admission of women? Should there be any differentiation?

Ms. **King.** In the mission?

Mr. Daniel. No. Would you differentiate between admission of women to the individual academies? The Military Academy opposed to the Naval Academy or Air Force Academy.

Ms. King. I see no differentiation between that except the Army has no restriction against women serving in combat so I don't think we have the legal disability although it hasn't affected the Army. The Army still finds it easy to discriminate with or without legal backing.

Mr. Daniel. Do you think a women could achieve the same result at one Academy as opposed to the other? Would one be more difficult over another?

Ms. King. I think the Air Force would be the easiest.

Mr. Daniel. You would not exclude either?

Ms. King. I would not exclude any from any of them.

Mr. Daniel. I am a little puzzled by the remarks in your opening statement. You say it is a fact that the academies are the only institutions completely devoted to the total professional military training and that "There is a great deal of difference between the ROTC graduate and the Academy graduate."

Are you questioning by implication the value of ROTC training in any way?

Ms. King. I am merely repeating what has been said in testimony preceding mine by the male components of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and this was a quotation from General Clark, I believe, of the Air Force. It wasn't my quotation.

Mr. Daniel. What is your opinion of ROTC training?

Ms. King. It is second to West Point, Annapolis, or the Air Force Academy. It should be. I mean it is sort of silly to have an Air Force Academy, a West Point, and an Annapolis if you can do it for a quarter of the price in ROTC. Of course, you don't have the same amount of training. How could you possibly? It is a part-time program.

Mr. Daniel. Haven't some of our best leaders come out of the ROTC program?

Ms. King. Some of our best leaders have and some have come from OCS. Some have walked in off the street and gotten a direct commission on the battlefield, but it is the intent of the Academy to create a professional military person.

Mr. Daniel. A professional combat leader.

Ms. King. Not necessarily combat leader.

Mr. Daniel. That is what the mission states.

Ms. King. I would hope what is more important is that we have strategy and tactics as the goal of what we are training the people in these academies for rather than merely charging up a hill. It is planning, it is directing, it is outsmarting the enemy. Not just running out in front and waving a flag. That is the least of it. It is the brains behind an operation and that is what we are training these people for, I hope.

Mr. Daniel. That is a good observation.

On page 2 you state, "The issue is not that of injecting women into combat; that it is a matter of permitting women the same freedom of choice as a man."

Are you suggesting that men who attend the academies have such freedom of choice?

Ms. King. Absolutely.

Mr. **Daniel**. Under the contract signed upon entering the Academy, each choice is removed from men, such a choice. Would you make it optional for women and compulsory for men?

Ms. **King**. When he signed the contract, he made the choice, didn't he?

Mr. **Daniel**. Yes.

Ms. **King**. Well, the women have to sign the contract too, you know.

Mr. **Daniel**. Of course. That would give you no problem?

Ms. **King**. Absolutely not.

Mr. **Daniel**. It is contradictory to your statement then?

Ms. **King**. In what way?

Mr. **Daniel**. In the way I just enumerated. You are setting up two standards in that paragraph. Men don't have a choice.

Ms. **King**. They have a choice of going to West Point or not going, or at least applying.

Mr. **Daniel**. The point is, after they get to West Point, they would not have a choice after they get there, but you are suggesting a choice for women.

Ms. **King**. If they have an ability to drop out, it seems to me they have a choice.

Mr. **Daniel**. On page 3 you state the Naval Academy provides the cadet with four times the amount of professional training received by Naval officers in other officer accession programs. Since you would—and you said this, or inferred it certainly—since you would allow women free choice in combat roles, why would they need as much professional combat training as men?

Ms. **King**. I am missing your point. Why would they need as much?

Mr. **Daniel**. Yes. If you are going to allow them the option of combat and you don't allow the same option to men.

Ms. **King**. Why don't we allow the same option to men?

Mr. **Daniel**. This is your statement, not mine.

Ms. **King**. I must have missed something.

Mr. **Daniel**. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Mrs. Holt?

Mrs. **Holt**. I certainly would like to commend you on your statement. I think it is very good. I compliment you on the great job you have done.

You are saying that you think the two-track system would be discriminatory. Did I understand you correctly?

Ms. **King**. That is correct.

Mrs. **Holt**. If we face the real world, you know, where we are right now, suppose we admitted women in September to the academies. Wouldn't it be discriminatory to make them—coming from the high schools with the training they have had—take the physical exams and compete physically with the men? Wouldn't that be discriminatory?

Ms. **King**. I don't believe it would be.

Mrs. **Holt**. You believe that that would be absolutely fair.

You feel that women at this point should be permitted to be into combat, to make that choice?

Ms. **King**. Yes; I do.

Mrs. **Holt**. I was interested in the Israeli situation when we were over there. They have really changed their view about it. They used women in combat in the first war that they fought, the War of Independence. But now they very strongly advocate that they do not—of course, they have a different motivation; they are fighting for their lives and they train the women but not for combat roles. They say that they have a two-track system. They universally train everybody for a different MOS and then the women serve in the Reserve until age 30, I think they told us, but it is a different system.

Do you feel that this is a valid assessment that they have made?

Ms. KING. Perhaps for themselves. I don't think it is a valid assessment for the United States.

Mrs. HOLT. You think we should train women for combat?

Ms. KING. If they wish to volunteer for combat, absolutely, yes.

Mrs. HOLT. Thank you.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. Colonel King, perhaps I was wrong when I said you had been a tank commander. It seemed to me in my conversation with you previously you had indicated that you had been at the Armor School and you had been involved in the actual tank work and so forth. Is this true?

Ms. KING. Two weeks ago I finished the advanced armor course. I graduated from the basic armor course 2 years ago. I have a secondary MOS and I have had it since 1972, as–1203, which is unit tank commander. It doesn't do any good though. It is merely on paper.

Mr. WILSON. It is your feeling that as a graduate of the Academy, an officer is just about assured of advancement, provided he has a normal career in the military, whereas it is extremely difficult for someone who is not an academy graduate. I am speaking of getting up to the generals and brigadier generals and above.

Ms. KING. Well, yes, but I think that is for a good reason. In the first place, you go to the Academy because that is your whole life interest and obviously 4 years of intensive training is going to make you, hopefully, a more qualified person and you should progress more rapidly, you should progress without question. But the opportunity for this background training should be equally available.

Mr. WILSON. I agree, and I was a little amazed when Mr. Callaway and the Army people were here and they said once a person became a second lieutenant, they couldn't distinguish between ROTC, Academy graduates, OCS, and those who got field commissions. This, of course, is hardly believable, is it, that they can't distinguish one from the other?

Ms. KING. I think it is seldom difficult to not recognize a graduate of the Academy. At the same time, you cannot recognize people who are not. Some of them appear just as good as top-notch West Pointers, but I have never, with one exception, met or seen a West Point graduate who didn't look and act like a West Point graduate.

Mr. WILSON. They have the records, too, that are available to them so they can find out. I would imagine they are pretty much earmarked, but, as you say, they should look better and they should conduct themselves better because they have been trained specifically for that. You believe admission should be available to anyone who has the desire to go and who meets all qualifications to attend the academies?

Ms. KING. By all means.

Mr. Wilson. In the event they desire to make a profession of the military, they should have an equal opportunity for promotion?

Ms. King. This is it. The whole thing is not promotion or how many thousand dollars worth of education is involved but the professional career. If you want to be a military careerist, why shouldn't you be allowed to be? Again I keep stressing, tacticians and strategists are more important than a platoon leader, and I am going to get a hassle on that, I am sure, but overall if you get away from the romatic part of it, it is true, it is the man who plans the operation and plans the campaign who is the important one.

Mr. Wilson. In the reserve work you have done, where you have been a tank commander, has this been among men?

Ms. King. Yes.

Mr. Wilson. It hasn't been an all-women's group you were with?

Ms. King. No. In all 3 years I have been the only female and I have all three times been the class leader. It is not a popular vote. It is a matter of who is senior in rank. I had no trouble and in fact, they were a tremendously fine group of men.

Mr. Wilson. You had no difficulty having the men follow you or take orders from you?

Ms. King. None whatsoever.

Mr. Wilson. This question was raised earlier. I think it wasn't too long ago that we questioned whether white soldiers would take orders from black officers and I think it has proven that they will and they have. I think the same thing would be true if women were given the opportunity to lead. If they are the right type of leaders, they can even engender the respect of the people who are underneath them and would have to take their orders. Would you agree with this?

Ms. King. Yes, and in the folder I presented to you is an article on Captain Jordan who was the first woman to complete artillery officers' school and her classmates are quoted throughout that article as saying they would follow her any time, that she would be a great battery commander, that she would be just as good and better than some men. This is one man after another who has given this testimony.

The men I have talked to have felt the same way. It is not the younger people. It is the old soldiers who hate female soldiers.

Mr. Hillis. I have very few questions since I think you have made most of the points in which I was interested, Colonel.

We have heard a great deal here about the difference in cost between ROTC and the academies, some $20,000 versus $60,000. I think probably we are getting value received in our officers who graduate from the military academies, are we not?

Ms. King. I believe so, yes, sir.

Mr. Hillis. That the program is worth it to the overall program of the United States?

Ms. King. That is right.

Mr. Hillis. And all you are asking is that women be given this same opportunity to participate?

Ms. King. That is true.

Mr. Hillis. Thank you.

Mr. Nedzi. Colonel, I would just like to clarify one statement which I thought you made. This may apply to the communication problem that existed with Mr. Daniel. You said something about, "If they wished to volunteer for combat." In what context was that made? If women "wished to volunteer for combat." I believe the discussion was whether you believed women should go to combat or not and you said if they wished to go to combat——

Ms. KING. I say if they volunteer, they should not be denied what I think is a privilege of serving in the combat arms, Right now it doesn't matter how much you want to or how capable you are still discriminated against based on sex.

Mr. NEDZI. You didn't mean to suggest that upon graduating from an academy the individual has a choice as to whether he is going to combat or not?

Ms. KING. I think I get it now. No. Upon graduation from the Academy they should go——

Mr. NEDZI. Where they are assigned just like anybody else?

Ms. KING. Absolutely, yes.

Mr. HOGAN. Colonel King, you made a statement that the service Academies are the only institutions of higher learning completely devoted to total professional military training. That is not quite true, is it?

Ms. KING. Are you referring to VMI and that sort of thing?

Mr. HOGAN. That type, yes.

Ms. KING. I would put them maybe a half step behind West Point if I am going to put ROTC a full step, but I still do not equate them with the Academies.

Mr. HOGAN. I can understand that but the accuracy of your statement is in question, that they are devoted totally to military training, are they not?

Ms. KING. I am not sure. Do they go into the military directly from VMI?

Mr. HOGAN. Yes. That is my information.

Now, another statement you make concerning the number of people who are promoted to brigadier general from the military academy and then you put that percentage in the context of every officer in the military, do you not?

Ms. KING. Yes.

Mr. HOGAN. That is a little unfair, isn't it?

Ms. KING. I think when you put them all together 32 percent of those promoted are West Point graduates, where only 9 percent——

Mr. HOGAN. How many West Point graduates were in the promotion zone and how many non-West Point graduates were in the promotion zone, from colonel to brigadier general?

Ms. KING. It must have been about the same proportion.

Mr. HOGAN. Do women compete with men for promotion in the Army?

Ms. KING. I am glad you asked that because Mr. Callaway, who is our Secretary of the Army, said they did. We do not. We have a separate promotion board. We have something entirely separate. We do not compete equally, as was erroneously stated previously.

Mr. HOGAN. In that connection then, is it still true that there were only four slots out of seven that were open to women in that promotion situation you described?

Ms. KING. Three slots out of seven.

Mr. HOGAN. How could you compete with the men? You just said you do not compete with the men.

Ms. **King.** We cannot compete with them because we are restricted based on sex. Even though I have completed armor, and I have a secondary MOS as tank commander, I cannot be in armor branch. Even though Captain Jordan has completed artillery school and did a beautiful job and is now an instructor in the artillery school on target acquisition, she cannot wear crossed cannons. She cannot be in the artillery.

Mr. **Hogan.** What you are saying is, you want, without any qualification, women to compete with men for promotion up and down the line?

Ms. **King.** Yes, I do.

Mr. **Hogan.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Nedzi.** Thank you very much, Colonel.

Our final witness is here at the request of Senator Packwood and she is Miss Susan Elizabeth Wells.

STATEMENT OF SUSAN ELIZABETH WELLS, SALEM, OREG.

Ms. **Wells.** Mr. Chairman, I am Susan Elizabeth Wells from Salem, Oreg. I am 17 years old and attend Sprague Senior High School in Salem. I have applied to enter the U.S. Naval Academy. Annapolis has a tremendous program which would be a great privilege and honor to be a part of.

I have always been fascinated by ships, by the sea and have sailed at a school in Seattle. July 8th of this year I completed the Hurricane Island Outward Bound course in Maine which was a very strenous course, both physically and mentally. At one time during a 5-day expedititION, we sailed and rode straight through for 48 hours. We did rock climbing, repelling. I will be taking a college-level calculus course during my senior year in high school. I wish to continue on in math after graduation. Annapolis has outstanding math and science departments. I believe the country should utilize qualified people disregarding sex. Granted, those women not qualified should not be considered but the United States, because more than 50 percent of its citizens are women, is not getting all the best possible leaders from the total population.

It has been stated that there is no need for coeducational military academies because women are now able to participate in ROTC. The ROTC program is a beginning, but why, if the program conceived is considered to be substantial to the Academy, are there two separate programs? The Naval Academy obviously has a higher educational program to which all citizens, regardless of their sex, have a right to try for. There is no legitimate reason for women not to engage in combat missions, or obtain the educational opportunities open to men. Vice Adm. William P. Mack, Superintendent of the Naval Academy said, "If the law were changed, in my mind women could do anything men could do. Having seen some Olympics on television and Billie Jean King, I think there would be many women who could meet the rigorous requirements of the program."

Mack said if the combat restrictions were dropped it would be quite easy to convert Annapolis into a coeducational school.

I would like to refer back to some previous testimony about the training that goes on, such as at Annapolis. The running. We train not every day, but we train from 1½ to 3 miles in the morning and at the end of the course we ran a 6-mile marathon and my time was 61 minutes and 11 seconds, and I am sure that with every day training that I would be able to qualify to live up to the standards of what the men are asked to do at the Academy.

The question as to whether Americans are prepared to commit their daughters to combat should be left open to the American family. Undoubtedly there will be some who will feel that they are proper, but to make such a broad interpretation to what is likely to contrast greatly between families is a prejudice.

I am willing to dedicate myself to a career in the naval armed services and officers to the very best of my ability. I ask that you consider the points I have made when you are forming your opinions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. NEDZI. Ms. Wells, I want to commend you on an excellent statement, excellently presented.

Have you examined the requirements of the various academies, the physical aptitude requirements? Do you have any knowledge as to what they specifically require?

Ms. WELLS. I did see the book the Academy puts out.

Mr. NEDZI. I was curious as to whether it was your feeling that you had known you would be able to fulfill those requirements. The number of pullups and pushups and the running requirements and all of these. You don't at this time know whether you would, in fact, qualify on that basis?

Ms. WELLS. No, because I don't know what exactly is expected.

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry all members of the committee were not here to hear Ms. Wells. I think she made a very fine statement.

This course you took at Hurricane Island, the "Outward Bound" course, was that just for women? Was it a mixed group?

Ms. WELLS. It was for anyone. The watch that I was in was just girls. We had a convoy which had three watches. Two of the watches were girls and one of the watches was boys. We went out and we did—like there was a 3-day island solo where you were set on an island by yourself and we did the various activities at the same time. The training expeditions, the 3-day training expedition, at the beginning of the course we took together for convoy and the final expedition, and various other activities.

Mr. WILSON. What are the age groups that were involved?

Ms. WELLS. The "Outward Bound" program goes for 16½ years of age and older.

Mr. WILSON. What is the maximum age?

Ms. WELLS. There is no maximum age.

Mr. WILSON. Was the course the same for girls as for boys?

Ms. WELLS. Yes, it was.

Mr. WILSON. How did the girls compete with the fellows? Was it comparable insofar as achievements are concerned?

Ms. Wells. Yes, it was.

Mr. WILSON. Insofar as—you say you have seen the Naval Academy catalog which shows the qualifications and requirements in it. You haven't read it completely to know what all the physical requirements are?

Ms. **Wells**. I don't remember seeing in it anything like the number of pushups and so forth. I don't know if that is in there. I did read through the whole catalog though.

Mr. **Wilson**. We have had this question of pushups and pullups which seems to be the big hangup of everyone here. I think it is probably the least important thing that should be considered for qualification to enter a military academy. It certainly seems to me that if for some physical reason young ladies are unable to do as many pullups or pushups as are required of the men entered in the Academy, that certainly there are other tests of their physical ability that could be substituted and I don't think that grants any special privilege. I think it is just ridiculous to consider this as something to prevent someone going to the Academy.

Certainly we have seen women track athletes in the meets that are taking place now and the times that some of the better women are performing in the 440 and the 1,500 meters and 800 meters and all of the events certainly prove that they are doing exceptionally well.

We are talking about the exceptional person when we talk about those who will be admitted to the Academy. It is not the average person. We are talking about the person who is going to be able to excell physically as well as academically and this is what we should keep in mind all the time.

I think we are talking in terms too often of what the person down the street can do. Every man isn't admitted to the Academy. It is very selective insofar as the men are concerned, and I think those women who have appeared here and those who have asked for consideration to have women in the Academy even today have not asked for anything special, but they ask for the same treatment given to the men and to compete on that basis.

I see no reason why they shouldn't be given that opportunity.

Thank you very much. I hope the day comes when young ladies like yourself will be given the opportunity to be admitted to our academies.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. **Hogan**. Mr. Chairman, just for the record, in our announcement of today's meeting we had Lieutenant Colonel King associated with the Army at Carlisle Barracks.

Ms. **King**. I am in the process of moving.

Mr. **Hogan**. You are not associated with the command there?

Ms. **King**. No.

Mr. **Hogan**. You are not appearing as an Army witness? You were appearing today as an individual witness?

Ms. **King**. That is correct.

Mr. **Hogan**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Nedzi**. Ms. Wells, I want to thank you again and commend you once again for an excellent presentation.

The committee will stand in recess until further call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the committee was recessed until further call of the Chair.]

House of Representatives,
Committee on Armed Services,
Subcommittee No. 2,
Washington, D.C., Thursday, July 18, 1974.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 10:15 a.m. in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. O. C. Fisher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. **Fisher**. The committee will come to order.

Our first witness this morning is Congressman Donald Fraser, from the great State of Minnesota.

We welcome you to the committee, Mr. Fraser and we are pleased to have the benefit of your testimony. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. DONALD M. FRASER, REPRESENTATIVE FROM MINNESOTA

Mr. **Fraser**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee.

Much excellent testimony has already been given on the admission of women to the service Academies. It has dealt with many of the issues far more thoroughly than I can. Therefore I am simply going to present a case—something that happened in my district—in the hope that it will make the problem more real to you and speed serious consideration of the question before us.

We were fortunate in Minneapolis this year that four of our first five nominees for an opening to the Air Force Academy were accepted: the principal candidate and the first, third, and fourth alternates. Of all the applicants interviewed, our interviewer said that two had the outstanding characteristics he looks for in the people he recommends for the Academies. The first, our principal candidate, had excellent college board scores, 4 years of football, letters in track and wrestling, National Honor Society, Boy and Eagle Scouts, president of the student council * * * the list goes on and on.

The other outstanding candidate was in the top 25 percent of the class, captain of the tennis team, had 3 years of swimming, was a racing skiier with a score of gold medals; had participated in debate and forensics, in an institute for talented youth, and a camp to learn how to survive alone in the wilderness living entirely off the land, and had been an exchange student. This was also the only applicant with a background in flying. This applicant, who became our second alternate, had a private sailplane license—and recognition as the youngest sailplane pilot in the State of Minnesota—and several hours of duo in a T–34. Along with this excellent preparation came a very specific ambition: to become a fighter pilot and to qualify for future aerospace programs.

We recommended both these outstanding applicants highly; the first was accepted; the second, the one with flying experience and the only one of our first five applicants to be so, was rejected. Evidently this nominee had reason to write "Please don't disregard this letter and throw it in the trash simply because I am a girl." Her nomination was "returned without action" with a letter saying, "Present Air Force policy restricts admission to males only, and we do not foresee a change in this policy for the class entering the Academy in July 1974."

I cannot concur in the Air Force's casual dismissal of our candidate's—we shall call her Mary's—application. I think that this decision would better have been made on individual merit than on blanket characterizations of one sex by the other.

Mary is thus far the best trained of all our candidates. She has prepared herself at her own time and expense specifically for this curriculum. She is also the best motivated of our applicants. Well aware of the difficulties a woman would face, our interviewer questioned Mary closely on her plans: "What would you do," he asked, "if you aren't accepted to the Academy?"

Her answer: She would enroll in the Air Force ROTC program of the University of Minnesota and work toward a 4-year nursing degree. Next year she would reapply to the Academy. If denied admission again, she would complete the 4-year program.

Why nursing? With nursing and ROTC in her background, Mary said, "I can get in the Air Force as a nurse, and if they decide to open up space travel to women, I'll be in the right spot." The interviewer's conclusion: "Mary was the most mature person I interviewed."

I am not here to demand Mary's automatic acceptance into the Academy. I am only here to say it is unreasonable that she was not even given a hearing, that the Academy would not even take action on her application. How unfair it is that General Clark, superintendent of the Air Force Academy should say that she is

> Incapable of competition, combative and contact sports, rugged field training, use of weapons, flying and parachuting, strict disciplines and demands to perform to the limit of endurance mentally, physically, and emotionally.

He has never met Mary; how does he know this?

I believe it is very possible that Mary could do between 3 and 20 pullups, jump between 5.3 and 9.6 feet, make between 35 percent and 95 percent of her basketball throws, and run the 300-yard shuttle in less than 67 seconds to satisfy the physical aptitude exam for admission to the Air Force Academy. Many women are not capable of the Academy's rigorous physical program; many men also are not. Academy applicants are an exceptional group of young people; the average—regardless of sex—cannot expect admission to these elite institutions.

How particularly unfair that General Clark could say that Mary and women like her will "erode the (Academy's) vital atmosphere." I am offended on Mary's behalf. I think it an insult to any American to assume capabilities inferior to those they possess, and deny privileges and opportunities on the basis of that false assumption.

Many instances from our history belie his remarks: During our war for independence, Mary Hayes was recognized by General Washington at the Battle of Monmouth. Her heroism has come down to us under a generic name, "Molly Pitcher." Another revolutionary soldier, Margaret "Captain Molly" Corbin, was cited for her courage by the Continental Congress after being wounded at Fort Washington. She is buried at West Point.

Testimony before this committee has shown the courage and ability of women under a variety of adverse conditions, such as war correspondents, nurses captured in the Pacific during World War II, et cetera. Since weaponry progressed beyond the club, the strong have possessed no necessary advantage over the weak. Since the development of the sword, the advantage has gone to the quick and well-coordinated; since the development of the rifle, to the best eye. With the development of a sobering technology of destruction, it is our responsibility to place the capability in the hands of the most stable and most intelligent decisionmakers at every level; neither sex has a monopoly on qualities of that kind.

The Armed Forces themselves tacitly admit the value of women in their recruiting of women into the services. An article on women in "Occupational Outlook Quarterly" states that:

> Servicewomen are now able to train for many jobs that have not been available to them in the past. While only 35 percent of all job specialties were open to women in early 1972, the number jumped to 81 percent in 1973. Women can now train for jobs as construction equipment operators, boiler technicians, military intelligence analysts and missile maintenance mechanics.

The services hope to quadruple the total number of women by 1977, indicating that far from being the near-useless appendages sometimes implied in debate on combat roles, women are important contributors in this profession, despite the restrictive regulations they now face.

Therefore, it seems that the issue before us is not whether women can serve in combat, nor whether they shall be admitted to the armed forces—they already are admitted in ever increasing numbers. The issue is one of sex discrimination: Will women be admitted to the ranks, but not the higher ranks; will men and women hold positions of equal responsibility in the services, or will men monopolize the positions of leadership and prestige to which academy graduation admits them, while women in the military—as in civilian life—continue in jobs that are less attractive, less prestigious and lower paying? You may argue that women have been upgraded, that there are even women generals now, but it is still true that until women are admitted to the academies, the most important route to advancement is denied them.

As I said earlier, I am not here today to demand the Academy accept Mary, only that it consider qualified applicants regardless of sex. Mary recognizes this in her letter of application when she says, "I realize there is a considerable amount of competition, however with my qualifications and the changing of the times, I feel I deserve an equal chance." And that's what I ask here today—for an equal chance—that well-qualified candidates be considered on their merits, not turned down on the basis of arbitrary factors over which they have no control: Religion, race, or sex. We ask of the academies that they become blind to the distinction of sex as they have already become color blind.

Not to do so is wasteful to all of us:

It is wasteful to Mary. Her application has already been returned without action once. She is applying to the University of Minnesota, to the nursing program and to Air Force ROTC. She is only willing to reapply once more; after that the loss of college credits becomes prohibitive and she will lose her chance of attending the Academy. Be very clear: As our interviewer said, "Mary will never be a waste; she will be productive whatever she does." But women a few years younger will rise faster, accomplish more, find their way easier than Mary because they came to college age when prejudice against women in the academies was overcome, while Mary left high school before we were willing to admit the justice of her case.

Nonadmission of women is wasteful not only to Mary, but to the Academy as well. It is losing a valuable cadet, and if lost it can never regain her particular capability, intelligence, dedication, and fine training.

Such discriminatory policy is also a loss to Mary's fellow soldiers—both women and men. We are denying them the finest in leadership by automatically excluding half the potential participants in our top leadership program.

An Air Force recruiting billboard in the Midwest announces in large letters: "COME AS YOU ARE", and in the middle of the group of young people is an attractive young woman with an ironic resemblance to Mary. How cynical that while we make an effort to recruit women into the forces—to quadruple their number by 1977—we are denying them access to the best educational program of their profession. We are squandering our human resources.

And finally, nonadmission of women is a shameful waste to the country. We are currently searching for recruits for a volunteer army. We need the Aviation Career Incentive Act to attract volunteers for aviation crewmember duties, yet we are disqualifying potential fliers on the basis of sex alone, without considering the merits of each case. As Susan Wells, herself an applicant to Annapolis, testified here on Tuesday, "I believe the country should utilize qualified people disregarding sex." I add to that, how can we obtain 100 percent results using only 50 percent of our people?

The Air Force wrote that Mary "Is to be commended for her desire to become a career officer in the USAF." The letter went on to suggest that I could pass along a pamphlet on Air Force ROTC for women.

But I do not wish to pass it along. Mary is far more knowledgeable than I in the routes through which she may obtain a commission. I wish instead to pass along a letter that says:

> We have carefully considered the letter of applicant Mary Jones and are pleased to—or regret to—inform you that Ms. Jones has been accepted—or rejected—as a cadet in the USAF Academy in Colorado Springs.

Until I can give that letter to her, I believe we do a disservice to Mary, to her fellow soldiers, and to the country.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you, Mr. Fraser, for an excellent statement.

I have one question which I believe is relevant to this inquiry. Is it your belief that the Congress should, by legislation, in effect adopt a new national policy of requiring American women engaged in military service, to serve in combat during wartime with or without their consent?

What are your views on that subject?

Mr. Fraser. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, I can give you a final answer on that. I would be prepared to support a law that required the military services to set standards with respect to combat duty and then to enforce those standards without reference to sex.

In my view, there are some combat roles that women clearly can play. There are others that perhaps are not so clear, but my impression is that the differentiation can adequately be dealt with by establishing uniform standards and then requiring that all of those who would be involved in combat, either voluntarily or by compulsion, should first have to meet those standards.

Mr. Fisher. Is it correct then to say that your view is that women, as distinguished from men, may be eligible and properly committed to some types of combat but not properly assignable to other types of combat in case of wartime. Is that your answer, or the gist of it?

Mr. Fraser. Mr. Chairman, I myself would prefer that there be standards set without reference to sex and that they be applied in determining who should be assigned to a combat role. There may be different standards for different kinds of combat roles, as there already are I believe in the different services.

Mr. Fisher. Very well.

I am still a little uncertain about what your views are on that subject, but I suppose we will let the record stand on it.

Mr. Fraser. Perhaps I could just try to clarify it.

The fact that someone is a woman rather than a man, in my view, should, to the maximum extent possible, and I think perhaps completely become irrelevant, but that does not mean that one cannot establish standards that may have the effect of screening out a large proportion of women, provided that the standards bear some relevance to the combat mission involved.

Mr. Fisher. Very well. Mr. Daniel?

Mr. Daniel. I have no questions.

I want to commend the statement. I think his statement is the most persuasive one we have had to date.

Mr. Fraser. Thank you very much.

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Hillis, I think you came in next.

Mr. Hillis. I, too, want to commend the gentleman. I think it is an excellent statement. Of course, it is problematical.

Would you care to hazard an opinion on just how many Marys would you say are in existence today? Are there, do you think, a number of young women who meet the qualifications and have the desire to do what this constituent of yours has indicated as her choice?

Mr. Fraser. I would guess that the numbers are significant but that, because there are so many obstacles—psychological and traditional—that the numbers are not nearly as great now as they would be if young girls growing up knew that this avenue was open to them on a parity with men. But in the present state of traditions and social attitudes and so on, I expect it is only the extraordinary young girl who perhaps probably prepared herself to the extent Mary has. I know there are others, but it would be hard to estimate the number.

Mr. Hillis. Thank you. That is all the questions I have.

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Nedzi?

Mr. Nedzi. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to join my colleagues on the subcommittee to commend the gentleman for what, to me, is the most eloquent statement I have heard in these hearings yet. In order to be sure that I understand your position, is it that women should be admitted to the academies without any reduction of physical standards or any other kind of standards?

Mr. **Fraser.** I am prepared to accept that now. I think that decency requires that as a minimum. It may be that the armed services will find it prudent for their own benefit to accept applicants for various types of specialty training or ultimately specialty service in which there might be some change in the standards. But again, it would be without reference to sex.

There are specialty careers within the military, many of them in noncombat roles. But I think the academies are thought of as sort of the elite central core from which the top military leadership is ultimately drawn, so they are not likely to move in that direction.

I would say at the moment, keep the standards where they are and require everyone to meet those standards.

Mr. **Nedzi.** Is that your position with respect to the admission of women to any part of the military?

Mr. **Fraser.** Who enter——

Mr. **Nedzi.** To any part of the military outside of the academies? Would you adopt the same attitude?

In other words, a women who wants to join the Tank Corps or the Infantry.

Mr. **Fraser.** No, I am prepared to have uniform standards but the military, for example, may want to take in somebody who is colorblind because of other attractive features, namely, that he can play football.

Mr. **Nedzi.** If she can play football, she ought to be admitted under the same circumstances.

Mr. **Fraser.** They may find reasons why they would want a particular applicant in which they would waive the standards. More generally, they may decide there are some categories of military service where the standards ought not to be as high, but this would because it is in the interest of the service.

I, myself, would not make that demand.

Mr. **Nedzi.** I have to confess that I find it difficult to argue with the logic.

One of the things which has concerned the subcommittee, and I am sure many others in the country, is this whole question of getting women into combat. What we do in the event that we have to reinstitute a draft, at which time we take people into combat involuntarily? I am not as bothered by the situation where a young lady expresses an interest in the academy and in effect volunteers. I am not upset about her going into combat as a volunteer, but when you have a situation, where people are summoned to fight all over the world involuntarily, another question arises. Does that cause you any difficulty?

Mr. **Fraser.** Well, not too much, but I think the armed services may want to establish further standards in determining who would go into combat.

I should add, I happen to be in favor of reestablishment of the draft so I regard your question as realistic. I am not as enthusiastic as to the all-volunteer Army.

Mr. **Nedzi.** That is another matter on which we agree.

Mr. **Fraser.** While assignments should be made without reference to sex, the method of obtaining personnel—by incentive or draft—is a second question and should depend in part on the interests of the military. An arrangement where service for women is voluntary while service for men is compulsory could only be transitional, I would think. If a universal draft is reinstated, I think the term "universal" should apply to women as well as men. The passage of the equal rights amendment probably makes this necessary.

Mr. **Nedzi.** I thank the gentleman.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mr. Dickinson?

Mr. **Dickinson.** I just have one question.

As has been pointed out in the hearings heretofore, women are precluded by law from participating in certain activities relating to combat. Would you be willing to support a change in the law to make no distinction whatever in or out of combat with relation to women?

Mr. **Fraser.** Yes.

Mr. **Dickinson.** Thank you.

Mr. **Fisher.** Mrs. Holt?

Mrs. **Holt.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, would like to commend our colleague for his very fine statement. It was very good.

You alluded in your testimony to the differences in the background, you know, the real world where we are today. Does it give you any problems to think about women competing on the same standards?

I am not sure that I understood your answer to Mr. Nedzi. I have been exploring the possibility of a two-track system. In other words, give women the opportunity to go into the academies, but with different standards, and leave the other standards as they are. How would you feel about that?

Mr. **Fraser.** Well, I would have no problem with the two-tier system, provided that one would drop the sex distinction in establishing it.

Mrs. **Holt.** Physical?

Mr. **Fraser.** You might, because of general physical differences in strength and endurance to the extent they exist and it is uneven, obviously, you might set up different categories into one of which, then, you would find most women would fall simply by reason——

Mrs. **Holt.** Of course we are going to get into equal rights for men if we are not careful here.

Mr. **Fraser.** That is the point. There may be some men who would like to get into the Academy who cannot meet the higher standards and I would not keep them out, by giving the women a preferred status in the so-called second tier.

Mrs. **Holt.** You do not feel it would be a disadvantage and this might work to the very detriment of what we are trying to do if you have to compete coming from the high school where you were not given the athletic opportunities that the male was?

Mr. **Fraser.** I understand. And if the Academies decided to establish a second category that would make it more likely that more women could get in, I think there is merit.

The only thing I would hope would not happen is that women would arbitrarily be excluded from the first category if they could meet the standards established for that. Similarly, I do not think men ought to be excluded from the second category if they can meet that but not meet the first category.

Mrs. HOLT. Thank you.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. I want to apologize for not being here. I have no questions. I did not have the advantage of hearing Mr. Fraser's statement.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hogan, do you have questions?

Mr. HOGAN. No, sir. Thank you.

Mr. FISHER. Very well. Thank you very much, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much. I appreciate your courtesy.

Mr. FISHER. You have been very helpful.

The next witness will be Congressman Stark, but pending his testimony—come on around, Mr. Stark—I might explain for procedural reasons it becomes necessary for us to go through a little procedure here to authorize an executive session which will not be imposed until after this hearing is completed, but we have another bill for markup which will require an executive session, and while we have a quorum, and under the rules it is necessary for us to make that determination at this time.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would move at the conclusion of the testimony here, at the proper time, this committee go into executive session for consideration of the bills on transportation of automobiles by the military.

Mr. FISHER. The clerk will call the role.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Fisher?

Mr. FISHER. Aye.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Dickinson?

Mr. DICKINSON. Aye.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Nedzi?

Mr. NEDZI. Aye.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Daniel?

Mr. DANIEL. Aye.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Montgomery?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Aye.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. Aye.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Hillis?

Mr. HILLIS. Aye.

Mr. FISHER. Very well.

Mr. Stark, from the great State of California, we welcome you to the committee this morning. We are pleased to have the benefit of your testimony and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. FORTNEY H. STARK, JR., REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I am honored indeed to be allowed to testify this morning on the bill you are considering, H.R. 10705.

I would with your permission ask that my written testimony that has been submitted be made a part of the record and, in the interest of saving your valuable time, I would like to just summarize it briefly if I may and add a few remarks.

Mr. FISHER. Without objection, that procedure is agreeable.

Mr. STARK. I would like to point out that we all, in one of the important jobs that we have in our districts, appoint nominees to the various academies. We are now precluded from appointing half of our constituents.

The opposition, as I see it, seems to be from traditional concepts and they are based, one, on women participating in combat, and the other on the question of facilities at the academy.

I would deal with the combat question at several levels. One, I think it is fair to say that perhaps less than 20 percent of the military personnel now participate in combat-type jobs.

Also, I would join with my colleague who preceded me here, Mr. Fraser, and I think I would be somewhat more definitive. I can think of absolutely no conditions under which women should be precluded from combat except those under which a man might be. I will get into that further.

As to the facilities, it has always seemed curious to me, and I know some of you gentleman have heard me address this in other forums, that we can admit foreign nationals to our academies and say that we do not have room for women, or for us to say we need some bathroom facilities when we can indeed get our astronauts to the moon. I am sure none of us would like to stand up in a broader forum and defend this, because we have ultimate faith in the ability of our services to create facilities quickly and efficiently when they're so inclined. If a lack of proper accommodations is the only reason to keep women out, let's quit stalling, let's build a few johns and let's get on with having women admitted to the academies.

The question of ROTC—and how it compares to an academy education—arises. It's important to note the $50,000 difference in cost between ROTC and the academies, but even more significant, I think is the fact that the road to the top in the military is smoothed if one has graduated from the academies. It's clear that the 55,000 women in uniform are indeed being denied the most direct route to the top.

The real question is that if we are not going to continually rarify the eliteism which we all too often accuse the academies of fostering, we in this country need women in the academies. We need their talents, we need their skills, we need their perspectives, and, perhaps, we need them more there than they really need the academies.

I would like for us all to think ahead to that day. I think it is coming; there's no question. I think there is some stalling, some getting used to a new concept, but I am afraid once we cross the threshold and do what is correct, we may be in the embarrassing position of having discouraged women from entering for so long that we may rule that day.

I would like to speak specifically now just for a moment to the question of women in combat.

If, indeed, we reinstate the draft, it would be my view that women should be drafted, either in lottery fashion, which I would prefer, right along with men or if they flunk the physical on the same basis that men flunk the physical, fine, they should be given a 4-F category.

There are physical differences among men, among women, as well as between men and women. I again would concur with the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Fraser, who would not like these differences categorized as to the sex, but as to physical characteristics.

I would go a step further. I have 3 daughters, the oldest of whom is 17, the youngest of whom is 12. I can state here that I would not object if it were their determination to enter into combat roles; I can think of one of the very lovely daughters of mine who could probably give some panic to some of the more diminutive members of my sex were she to determine that she wanted to be combative.

I think I could say that if the draft were reinstated I would feel it would be only fair that my daughters stand the chances of being drafted along with my son. I know that is a consideration that we will all make and all of our constituents will ask us to make as we vote on this.

I thank you again for the opportunity of letting me add my voice to the many across the Nation.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, JR., REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, as plaintiff in a suit to allow a female constituent to attend the Naval Academy, I urge your favorable consideration of pending legislation to open the academies to women. In my judgment, this is a vital step in extending equal rights to all segments of our society. More pragmatically, it is an essential ingredient of the success of our all volunteer army and the viability of our military establishment in the future. The exclusion of women by law and tradition, and of minority members due to rigid standards favoring middle class whites, deprives the academies and services of input from important segments of our society.

As a Member of Congress— with responsibility for nominating qualified individuals—I'm expected to discriminate on the basis of sex in my selections. I could not do this, so I nominated a woman. The service refused to process her application, and I went to court. The matter is still being litigated. But it is clear to me that Congressional action is the most direct way to put this question to rest. Let me share with you some reasons why it's imperative that we act.

According to military spokesmen, the principal reason for barring women from the academies is a legal and traditional prohibition against their participation in combat. It's argued that the academies' mission is to produce combat leaders, which females can not now become. But only 54% of America's active servicemen are in combat units, and only 17% have fighting jobs, according to DOD's own figures. According to statistics provided by a distinguished member of this Committee, Samuel Stratton, 253 of the 834 Air Force Academy graduates or nearly one-third of those commissioned in 1973 were assigned to non-combat roles. For West Point the non-combat ratio was 162 of 899, or one-fifth of the commissioned graduates. Further, an Air Force witness testified that between 20-25% of each year's entrants to their school are ineligible for combat positions due to eyesight. The men are nevertheless admitted and are trained for supportive leadership roles. What's more, the academies have a practice of admitting a number of foreign nationals. It's difficult to believe that women must be denied places at the academies because the spots are needed for men fully eligible for combat when foreigners occupy places but of course never serve. It seems singularly inappropriate for the academies to open their doors to a Laotian or an Iranian, while slamming them in the faces of American females.

I think it's indefensible to exclude women from the military institutions whether they go on to assume actual combat assignments or not. But it should be noted that combat is defined so broadly today that it's as likely to describe a technician at a computer as a Green Beret.

It's important to note that women are finding a military career an increasingly attractive alternative. They are volunteering in record numbers, with 55,000 throughout the services today. Altogether there are 35% more women in uniform than just three years ago and this number is expected to more than double by 1978. And just as a military career is attractive to some females, so too can actual combat be acceptable to some. Women who are qualified and so inclined should be eligible for such a post. The important thing, I think, is to create a military that assigns personnel to jobs—all jobs—on their qualifications and interests without regard to sex.

Let me briefly touch upon some of the other reasons why Congress must move to include women in these institutions for which male and female taxpayers foot the bill. First, it's clear that the services are dragging their collective feet, working as obstructionists in a cause they will clearly lose sooner or later. Their policy seems to be one of stalling, hiding behind excuses ranging from lavatory design to "diluting the commonality" of the academy experience. But their posture is doomed as either Congressional action or equal Rights Amendment can be expected to put their antiquated arguments to final rest before too long. My answer to this procrastination is, let's remodel a few johns and get on with the business of providing academy training for the qualified young people who seek it.

It's argued that women are afforded ample opportunity for leadership positions in the military through ROTC. But let us analyze this position. Army Secretary Howard Callaway estimated that he looks to West Point for approximately 45% of his officers. Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. George Brown, while shying away from labelling ROTC trained officers inferior to their academy counterparts, did admit that there is a "great difference" between men of each group. Air Force Secretary McLucas expanded on this, saying that "academy graduates are more likely to be people who seek responsibility and who have prepared themselves well for the future."

As a taxpayer and concerned citizen, I'm glad to learn that there's a discernible difference, because it costs an estimated $20,000 to send someone through ROTC and an average of $70,000 to train an academy student. The latter is an exorbitant sum in any case, but all the more exorbitant because the institutions are exclusive "male only" clubs.

In summarizing his opposition to admitting women, Secretary McLucas testified that "we can't afford $79,000 to train noncombat officers. Why buy a product if we aren't going to use it?" The Secretary and I agree to a point. It's true that tax dollars should not be spent on training that goes to waste. Instead, in my view, we must offer the education to everyone qualified—including women—and then see that their expertise is put to good use. At a time when the services must recruit aggressively to meet required force levels, when the percent of high school graduates is dropping and minorities are rising disproportionately, women recruits are currently being sought to bail out a wavering system. But women certainly have no obligation to come to the aid of a system that denies them access to the most prestigious educational and leadership opportunities.

In short, women should, with haste and without question, receive appointments to the academies. The fact is that we need them there—with their talents and skills and perspective—far more than they need the academies.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you, Mr. Stark. I think you have made your position rather crystal-clear regarding the combat aspect of the use of women in the military service. A good many of the witnesses are not quite as certain of their position. You seem to be very clear about your views on it.

That is, it is your view that, as a national policy, hereafter in the United States, American women should be available for combat duty in wartime without restriction, with or without their consent.

Mr. STARK. That is correct.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Daniel?

Mr. DANIEL. Thank you very much, Mr. Stark, for your testimony this morning.

How do you view the all-volunteer service? Do you think, as some have suggested, that the Selective Service should be reinstated?

Mr. STARK. I tend to prefer the all-volunteer service.

I would like to see the jobs higher paying, with the tendency to have retirement after 20 years and have people come out with an inadequate pension and back in the job markets ended; I would favor longer terms of service, higher pay, careers in service be life-long careers, as many of us have in business, and hopefully in politics. So I see a great advantage in the volunteer service.

I would like to give it a greater chance. On the other hand, if it does not work, I would have no strong objection to our reverting to universal military training.

Mr. Daniel. Thank you, Mr. Stark.

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Hillis?

Mr. Hillis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For the record, to make it crystal-clear here, as I understand the gentleman, if your daughter were physically able and a draft were instituted, you would have no objections if she were called to service, and if we were involved in such an operation as Normandy in World War II, or Tarawa, that she would go ashore with a rifle in her hand and bayonet on the end of it?

Mr. Stark. God forbid that would ever come to pass, but if it did, I could have no more objection if my daughter were drafted and put in that situation than if my son were.

Mr. Hillis. Thank you. That is all the questions I have.

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Nedzi?

Mr. Nedzi. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I should like to say that I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that our colleague from California had articulated his position very heavily, and he has left no questions.

Thank you.

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Dickinson?

Mr. Dickinson. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fisher. Mrs. Holt?

Mrs. Holt. No questions.

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Wilson?

Mr. Wilson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to state to my friend from California I am in complete agreement with his statement. I think he has made a good statement. I think it is interesting that the ladies who were here Tuesday representing different organizations, in addition to a Reserve officer in the Army, agreed with you that women should be subject to combat responsibilities as well as just having the privilege of serving in restricted jobs.

This idea that we look forward—by some of our members—that if women are given combat responsibilities or if the law is repealed that prohibits them from being in combat, that they would automatically all be in combat if they are in the service, of course is not quite accurate, because people still are assigned according to their MOS. We still hope that the system in the services would assign people where their proper role should be, and it may be that not many women would be assigned combat roles, but they would be subject to it.

That is if we did repeal the law. I think, as I have said before, that we have a lot of hangups, we have to try to get over them because this thing, in my opinion, is going to come.

I have submitted a bill which will be considered I think when we consider the full legislation which will repeal the combat restriction. I think we have to eliminate the excuse that Air Force and Navy are using for prohibiting women from being accepted or considered for entrance into these two academies.

Of course, West Point does not have this prohibition, but they do have a regulation prohibiting it.

Again I would like to commend you for your statement, and to assure you of my complete support for your position.

Mr. Stark. I think the gentleman, I congratulate him for his foresight in the bill he has prepared to submit for striking that combat restriction.

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Montgomery?

Mr. Montgomery. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Mr. Stark for his testimony this morning. He has shown a great interest in the bills that this subcommittee has had before it, not only in the committee but on the floor. He certainly keeps us on our toes.

Thank you again for testifying.

Mr. Stark. Thank you.

Mr. Fisher. Thank you very much, Mr. Stark.

Mr. Stark. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fisher. Our next witness is Miss Jacqueline Cochran. We are honored and delighted to have you with us, Miss Cochran, to testify on this subject of the admission of women into the service academies. We are all quite aware of the distinguished career which is identified with your lifetime of service to America.

I think it would be of interest to all of us if you would begin by briefly relating a little bit of the background of your career, the experiences you have had, which would be relevant in the record to identify you as a qualified person to speak on this subject.

I think we all recognize thoroughly that you are peculiarly well qualified to speak on this subject. But would you favor us with something about your background and your career, Miss Cochran, before you open your statement?

Miss Cochran. Mr. Chairman, that is very kind of you.

I have had a rather unique career as a woman. I was in England during the Battle of Britain, I flew a bomber across the North Atlantic, and was able to help cure a problem in Canada that was going on among the pilots that had been drafted from many of the areas that were not in war at the time.

A woman can do anything that a man can do that does not require brawn and I think certain types of exposure. Now, the gentleman from California saying that a woman would get off the boat and meet the enemy as a man would, I do not think you are going to find many who are going to agree to that. I would be most appreciative if every Member of this great, distinguished body of ours, the Congress, would query every woman in their district. I am using it in the generic term because I do not think you are going to find that the majority of women feel that way about it.

Talking about the draft, the morning before, the night before, the day before a woman might have started her family, you cannot just draft women harry-scary because they are between 18 and 25 years old or 30 years old. That is a lot of hocum. There is just no way.

Surely I have had a unique career in aviation. I have never used a dime of taxpayers' money to further my own career, not a penny. Of course, I think the country has gone a little crazy. Economically we are in pretty bad shape. We think nothing about spending a few more billions. I do not see the justification in some of the things being advocated in the testimony here before this distinguished body. I just do not agree with it, I am sorry.

I have a very simple low-key written statement which expresses what my feelings are.

Mr. **Fisher.** Very well. I read your statement yesterday.

Miss **Cochran.** I am honored, sir.

Mr. **Fisher.** I think it is very good. I suggest that you read it.

Miss **Cochran.** I can just file it with the committee.

Mr. **Fisher.** No, I think it would be well for you to read it.

STATEMENT OF MISS JACQUELINE COCHRAN

Miss **Cochran.** It is only 6 minutes. With your permission and indulgence, I would like to.

It is my firm very considered opinion that women should not be permitted to enroll in the Air Force Academy. I limit this first statement to the Air Force Academy only because I am more familiar with these operations than with the other academies, but the basic reasoning would be the same in the case of all of the military academies.

If I may digress here from the written statement, I was consultant to Senator Symington, then Secretary Symington, when the legislation was written to put women into the Air Force. I helped to write some of the legislation. I agreed with the way it was written.

I was privileged to reorganize the WAFs under General Vandenberg, got it back on the track. They are pretty difficult, women are; I know, I have dealt with them my whole life.

The basic reason why I hold this opinion is that the Academies are for the purpose of teaching combat to their students.

The courses of study and work are designed around this central theme. Women should not go into combat and therefore they should not receive this specialized training.

Never has a woman, to my knowledge, gone into combat in the American military forces. Even in England's darkest days during the Battle of Britain, there was no suggestion that women be used in combat. The same is true, I believe, of all the other countries of Europe except Russia; and I have been informed on good authority that although the Russian women, when their very life and existence was at stake when Germany invaded, were not used as front line soldiers but were used on a logistics basis supplying the troops with ammunition, food and other necessities.

If women are to be accepted into the military academies, it follows either that at the same time a law should be passed whereby they will be used in combat and whereby they agree to such use or in the alternative there should be two courses—one for the men and another for the women. To have two tracks of study in the same school would only add to the expense already great and serve no useful purpose.

Of course, there are many places in the Armed Forces for women excluding combat. There are many women already in the armed services in such work. For this administrative work, the training is different than in the military academies.

It costs now about $80,000 to graduate a student at the Air Force Academy whereas ROTC where the women can receive their training for administrative and other noncombat work can graduate a student for about $12,000.

The Academies are already full. That means if a woman is to be brought in either the facilities must be expanded at the taxpayer's expense or a man must be dropped out of the program.

It is true a small percentage of the Air Force Academy graduates are not assigned to combat oriented work; but they all have combat oriented training and are available for combat in case of national need.

My opposition to women going into the military academies is not because I am against so called women's lib. I am neither for or against women's lib; but what I have just said has really nothing to do with the pros and cons of women's lib. Whatever is to be done about women elsewhere, they should not go to the Military Academies for the primary reasons stated.

During World War II at the request of the British government, supported by our own authorities, I took 25 women pilots to England. During their preliminary flying tests in Canada, there was about a 40-percent elimination rate. These women did ferrying work for the British Forces but not combat work. After about a year in England, I was called home by General Arnold, Commanding General of the Army Air Forces, to head up a women's pilot training program called WASPS, again for noncombat duty. Although it was publicized that only about 1,500 to 2,000 women would be taken for training, over 63,000 applied. Many were eliminated for physiological and psychological reasons before flying training. The attrition rate after training was completed among the WASPS ran about 36 percent, most of whom resigned to get married.

I call that pretty expensive use of manpower or womanpower.

There are sound biological reasons why a woman should not be trained for and used in combat. A person who has received very expensive training for combat must give a long period of service to the Government to justify this—perhaps as long as 20 or 30 years in combat readiness.

A woman's primary function in life is to get married, maintain a home, and raise a family. That is certainly what happened to most of the WASPS and the 25 women who went to England with me. Strangely enough, practically none of these women did much with their flying after the war was over.

A woman can compete with the men in cases where physical brawn or continuity and regularity of service are not required. Such continuity and regularity are required in combat training and combat readiness.

I have noticed that in many of the professions in the United States such as medicine or law where the schools are opened to women only a very small minority of the graduates are women and only a small minority of these women graduates carry on for long in the practice of their profession.

I have taken my own poll among approximately 250 mature people—more than half were women—and asked them whether they are for or against women entering the Air Force Academy, without indicating my own views. Practically 100 percent of these voters were against it. In fact all of the women were opposed and the only supporters were two or three men. One of these men, a doctor who is a friend of mine, is all for women going into combat. He has five daughters and I asked him if he wanted to get rid of them.

I just had the privilege of talking to the 4,000 cadets at the Air Force Academy about a month ago.

I can also fancy in my mind the disruption that would follow if 100 normal women were entered with 4,000 normal men in the Air Force Academy.

I can also fancy in my mind what would be the result if women entered combat and were captured by the enemy. No, I think the rights of women should stop short of entering the military academies; and in pursuing these rights, they should follow other routes that are open to them.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you very much, Miss Cochran, for a very illuminating statement.

How much flying experience have you had in your lifetime?

Miss COCHRAN. Well, sir, I have logged about 15,000 hours. Just before I became ill, I was working with Lockheed on the rigid rotor program. Then the last two things I did in interest and importance were, I flew the F-104 for the high temperature tests for the big engine about 5 years ago, and the T-38 jet trainer for Northrop Corp.

Mr. FISHER. There is a provision in the law now, Miss Cochran, with which I am sure you are familiar, which prohibits women being used for combat flying purposes.

Miss COCHRAN. I think they should not be used.

Sir, I was shot at over the North Atlantic and I crossed the Atlantic several times during World War II. Maybe I am one of these unique women like Mary, but when I was a child I went to work 12 hours a night in a cotton mill before I was 8 years old without shoes and I became pretty hardened to the facts of life. I don't think that is the way women should be brought up.

I certainly don't think I was properly brought up. I think I have been privileged to serve this Nation and it has honored me with every possible honor that can be given to a citizen. I am grateful, but I would rather have had a little different life and I think a lot of these women 25 or 30 years from now are going to be awfully sorry that they didn't take a little different attitude.

I think every human being should be paid equally for equal production. Of course, the labor unions don't allow that, but they should be paid equally regardless of sex. But I think there are certain areas where women—as the future mothers of this country—have no business being. Even if they want to, they should be restrained. I feel you will not get a high percentage of them because I know what went on during my own training program in the WASPS. They all got married just as fast as they could find a good-looking man who would marry them and 36 percent of them went on to follow their husbands and have a family.

I agree with women being in the Congress. I ran for Congress and lost by 700 votes. There are many things where women are very, very valuable, but I think to take a young girl from 18 to 35 years old and force her to go into the armed services, well, it is going to be a sad day.

If our country is invaded, I think every man, woman, and child would take a pitchfork as they would have in England and go after the invader, but that is not delegating a woman to combat. I think it is ridiculous.

Mr. **Fisher**. It has been developed in testimony here that there is no nation in the world today that requires women to do combat duty in warfare. If this Congress should decide, as a national policy, that we should start a new program in America to allow women to be committed to combat, with or without their consent once they are in military service, that would be a major change in the system that has been followed traditionally throughout the history of this country, is that not correct?

Miss **Cochran**. Well, that certainly is.

Of course, that is correct, but, sir, that is not the point. You can't take the future mothers of this country and say, "Whether you like it or not, you are going to get off a landing craft," if you have ever studied the pictures of those men who had to do this on D-day.

No, it is not right. I mean it is abnormal. I know that most of the members of this committee are Democrat and most of my friends in the House happen to be Democrats, but I am a Republican. I was therefore privileged to get the first commitment from General Eisenhower to seek the nomination for office. The first thing that he said in Paris 10 minutes after he had made this statement was, absolutely with tears in his eyes—I recorded it for his library—he said, "If only my mother were here."

He used some of our facilities at the ranch for 7 years as an office. He often talked about his mother. He never talked much about his father.

Also a great man was just lost in Tuohy Spaatz. He was the same kind of person. He would talk about his mother by the hour. Mothers are pretty important people.

What are we going to do, develop test tube babies and put them away to be reared somewhere?

Are we going to break up the whole pattern that the Lord intended that we follow? I think it is ridiculous. I don't see it.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Daniel?

Mr. **Daniel**. I am speechless, Mr. Chairman.

Very eloquent indeed. I have known Miss Cochran for many years and have always admired her greatly and am so pleased to have her here this morning.

Like the other witnesses, I don't think she left very many questions for us to ask.

I would like to make this observation, Mr. Chairman, especially after what Mr. Wilson said a moment ago. The deeper that we get into the matter, the more convinced I am that we are addressing the wrong subject. We are putting the cart before the horse. It seems to me what we should be discussing are the requirements for women to engage in combat. If a bill was introduced to bring about that result and was approved by the Congress, the admission of women to the academies would be academic, wouldn't it?

Miss **Cochran**. Well, yes, but don't you think, sir, you should let all of the women, not just a few of the women, express their views as to whether they would want to go into combat?

Mr. Daniel. I am not suggesting it, Miss Cochran. What I am saying is if we put this test to the Congress and ask them whether they want to change the policy, and then if the representatives of the people say, "We want to change the policy and require that women go into combat," then admission to the academies would be academic. They would be there.

Miss Cochran. Sir, that would make women subject to draft in time of war. It would have to. I mean you draft everyone if you need them in war.

Mr. Daniel. I am not advocating this. I am saying this is the road I think we ought to take if we are going to do what we are talking about here.

Miss Cochran. I agree with you, but I think before you vote on such an important subject you should give the majority of the women of this country an opportunity to speak on it.

There were two WAVES here. One said to me, "I agree with you. I don't think women should be in combat and I think the whole thing is ridiculous." I hope they are still here.

Mr. Daniel. Thank you so much, sir.

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Hillis.

Mr. Hillis. Miss Cochran, I certainly enjoyed your statement and it is a pleasure to have you here today. I might say my sister, just a couple of years older than I, volunteered to be in the WASP in World War II, but physically her eyes didn't permit to her pass.

She went on to accumulate about 1,500 hours, including an instructor's rating, and taught Naval cadets to fly in a little piper cub in their college program, but after the war she gave it up and hasn't flown for 25 years.

The area I want to go into with you would be a kind of a third area. Women are establishing very important and long careers today in the military and they are serving in many, many more positions. I think it is fine and well that they do so, even though they are not permitted to go into combat, and I don't think that they should.

However, if we are going to have women generals, and we do, and women field grade officers, and we do, do you think that they should have the very best of training that might be available that our country could give them so they would be very, very well qualified leaders?

Miss Cochran. Well, I just can't see a two-track system in our institutions that are primarily created to find our leaders. I don't know my facts, but I would make a pretty good ballpark guess that every leader in World War II—I mean the real leaders—were Academy-trained, and I just don't see that women need be in this kind of preparation. In fact, I am not too keen on coeducational schools. I think if men and women are normal—they jolly well better be if they are in the military services, and I think there is too much disruption and too much—I have been on one university board for 16 years, one of the top ones in the country, and I am not too keen about all of this foolishness that is going on.

There is a deterioration in our youth today and the percentage is not small. All you have to do is drive around this country and travel as much as I have in the last 2 years by motor vehicle—because of not being able to fly any more. I have been just astounded at the lack of discipline in our youth. It is just because the women don't stay home and take care of their kids. I bet your sister is taking care of hers.

Mr. HILLIS. She didn't marry so she couldn't get into the full category. She doesn't fly any more either.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Nedzi.

Mr. NEDZI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to add my compliments to Miss Cochran for her forceful testimony but, as one who has a deep belief in individual freedom, I have to confess that I have some trouble telling a woman that she cannot go into combat if she volunteers for it. If she wants to go. How do we rationalize that?

Miss COCHRAN. Well, she just might be meeting a very, very important group of men that morning to go on a military mission, and because of the physiological difference between men and women, be unable to fulfill her duties. Is that plain enough?

It can happen with women all the time. It happens with women and it doesn't happen with men. I am sorry. Of course, a man could get sick too, but he is not as likely to. The chances are that he won't as easily as a woman.

Mr. NEDZI. Is there any other reason why we should not——

Miss COCHRAN. I knew I'd get some laughs.

Mr. NEDZI [continuing]. Let women volunteer for combat?

Miss COCHRAN. Yes. Because you don't let crazy people run around the streets. You put them in a home. I think women are nuts if they want to go into combat.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Dickinson.

Miss COCHRAN. Forgive me for the slang, sir.

I haven't adequate vocabulary to express my indignation over women who want to go into combat.

Mr. DICKINSON. I want to thank you for your appearance here. It is real good to see you again. I think your contribution has been very meaningful and certainly helpful. Even amusing in spots. It is good to see you again and we appreciate very much your being here and I have no questions.

Miss COCHRAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. FISHER. Mrs. Holt?

Mrs. HOLT. It certainly is an honor to have you with us this morning and I think it is interesting to hear some of your statements because you have probably done more for the women's movement than any of us. You have demonstrated that women can do anything; that they can lead men; that they can lead anybody, so I think we owe you a great debt.

I have some of the same very great fears that you have that if we aren't careful we are going to destroy the family in this country and I really think that is important.

Miss COCHRAN. No question about it.

Mrs. HOLT. We don't want to see it destroyed and I think we have to take a look at history and see what has happened to other civilizations and what other people are doing. We are going to have to treat this very, very carefully. We are going to have to make certain that we provide the education for all the girls. I have no questions. Thank you very much for being with us.

Miss Cochran. You are very kind, Mrs. Holt, and I admire all of you who come to the Congress of our country and become leaders. And I think this is certainly a very important calling, very important, and I wish more women would take up this kind of thing, but take care of their families at the same time.

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Wilson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You are a perfect example of why women should be able to do this. I think the things you have accomplished, Miss Cochran, are evidence that women have the same ability as men and can do anything that men can do. I am surprised that you would feel that they shouldn't be given——

Miss Cochran. They can do one thing a man can't do, sir.

Mr. Wilson. I suppose that is bearing children, is that correct?

Miss Cochran. That is correct, and that is one of their primary wishes.

Mr. Wilson. I think with the great success you have had as an outstanding pilot and a leader during military times, even though you were on transport duty rather than in actual combat—it would be pretty hard to distinguish, I would think.

Didn't you feel qualified to fly a bomber yourself in those days?

Miss Cochran. Well, sir, I flew bombers. I have flown everything that ever had wings on it up until now.

Mr. Wilson. Why shouldn't women be given that opportunity?

Miss Cochran. To go into combat?

Mr. Wilson. Surely.

Miss Cochran. I am not backing down. If there was no chance or possibility that a woman could be taken prisoner as a person in the war fighting—I am not talking about nurses taken or Catholic Sisters or school people—then maybe it wouldn't be too bad for them to fight. It isn't quite the same dirty work but I am still against it. I just cannot see our women being (1) drafted, (2) indiscriminately against their will be put in combat. I think there would be a very, very small number who would volunteer for combat. I think a great national poll should be taken. I mean thousands upon thousands of people. Not one of these little samplers. My poll has been kind of interesting.

Mr. Wilson. What do you think would happen if we had a poll of the men as to whether they wanted to go into combat?

Miss Cochran. I don't think the average man would want a woman in combat. I don't think he would want his daughter in combat. I don't believe so. If so, he must have developed a hatred for women.

Mr. Wilson. I am saying, why don't we poll the men as to whether the men themselves want to go into combat. I think you would find a negative poll there too, wouldn't you?

Miss Cochran. Yes, but they have to do it, you see.

Mr. Wilson. Why?

Miss Cochran. Because they are men and we don't have to do it because we are women. I am being very logical as a woman now.

Mr. Wilson. On page 4 of your statement you said that in many professions in the United States, such as medicine or law where the schools are open to women, only a very small minority of the graduates are women and only a small minority of these women graduates carry on their profession. Do you think that is accurate?

Miss Cochran. Yes, sir, I believe it is.

Mr. WILSON. Of course, women were discriminated against for some time in law schools and medical schools. It is only recently they have been admitted in reasonable numbers. Perhaps we don't have statistics to prove this is either correct or incorrect.

Miss COCHRAN. I think a lot of the medical schools have been very fair about taking women. They make excellent doctors as pediatricians, certain areas of research, and there is an area that I have worked in quite a bit. I think it is absolutely astounding. Many women doctors drop out during the discipline of the course or they do not carry on as a doctor. They stop and raise a family and do what women are supposed to do.

Mr. WILSON. Their attrition rate you make reference to both in the medical and law schools, and also among the WASPS that you commanded in World War II, you mentioned 36 percent?

Miss COCHRAN. Yes, sir. I have accurate figures.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Hogan, what is the attrition rate at the Academy these days? Isn't it 30 or 40 percent?

Mr. HOGAN. It is in that area.

Mr. WILSON. You are talking about today and the attrition rate is high among men at the Academy. You are going back to World War II where the morals and standards of women were considerably different from what they may be today as far as what their goals are. I don't think this 36 percent is unusually high.

Miss COCHRAN. This was after they graduated, which was very disturbing to me, sir.

Mr. WILSON. It is not out of line with what the figure is for men in the academies?

Miss COCHRAN. Maybe your selection process is poor. Maybe that needs to be looked at. There is always room for improving anything.

Mr. WILSON. On page 5 you say you can imagine what the disruption would be if there were 100 normal women with 4,000 normal men at the Air Force Academy.

What we would hope for, I think would be 25 percent. General Clark acknowledged if women were to be admitted to the Academy he would hope there would be about 25 percent, I think, unless I am in error. This would be a better ratio and might make for a better situation. I don't know.

It might be bad if there were just 100 women with 4,000 men.

Miss COCHRAN. I believe with all my heart if you polled every good institution of higher learning today or whatever area you go to, I think they take from 17 to 21 or 22—I think you would have a pretty rough job finding 1,000 women in 1 year to go into the Academy if they had to face combat.

Mr. WILSON. Why don't we find out?

Miss COCHRAN. It would be very interesting to find out.

Mr. WILSON. Let them be free to be admitted to the academies. Let's find out how many qualified women would apply. Just because a womanapplies doesn't mean she will be accepted.

Miss COCHRAN. She may be physically qualified and not academically qualified. There might be all kinds of reasons but just basing it on desire, waiving everything, I think you would have trouble finding 1,000 a year.

Mr. Wilson. Mr. Fraser only used one example but there are undoubtedly others. There is a young lady sitting in the audience today who testified before us Tuesday who impressed me with the fact that she would be qualified to enter the Naval Academy physically as well as academically.

I think that we are misjudging the ability and the capabilities, physically as well as academically, of the young women we have. I think we are missing a good resource in not allowing them to take advantage of this great educational opportunity that is available to men only.

Miss Cochran. You may be right, sir. That is what makes horseracing. We are both entitled to our opinion. I think there are some things which even traditionally should be kept as they are.

Mr. Wilson. You have a concern about women who might be taken as prisoners of war. We would have concern about any women and we are concerned about our men as well. During World War II weren't there many nurses captured in the Philippines and didn't they conduct themselves well? We have one experience of a close friend who was a prisoner of war while the Philippines were occupied and she had a rough experience, but she came out a fine nurse and she continued in nursing and it didn't destroy her life. I think we have had examples like this of women who have been just as brave and just as courageous as men when POW's.

Miss Cochran. I can only base this on my own experience. I had a business which I sold that employed about two-thirds women. It was fairly good size. I employed about 1,000 people. I had that business for over 20 years. I like my sex and I respect them and I think they can do anything a man can do if it doesn't require a certain regularity of performance and so on.

There are exceptions physically and there are exceptions psychologically. There are some exceptions among women. I doubt if there are very many women who would have taken off in some of the weather I did.

After the war was over, I went out to Arizona and bought a whole flock of P-51's—they were only $800 apiece so I am not being expansive—and, as a result, some of my work with these airplanes made them very useful in the Korean war before we had enough—we got back in the war before we thought we were going to get in.

Now, many of these women's families were wealthy or they had money in their own right. They didn't compete with me for records in races. I don't know why. I got these races open to women by the consent of the men. I didn't go to Bendix and say, "Let me into Bendix."

I went to every pilot who was going to fly and asked "Wouldn't you like to have a little competition from a dame?" And they agreed, and I beat them.

On the other hand, if I had been so fortunate as to have had my children live, I don't think I would have done many of these things that I have done. I don't think there is any question about it.

Mr. Wilson. Mr. Chairman, we are pleased to have Miss Cochran with us today. Again I will say she is a perfect example of what women can do, what they should be given the right to do, and I would hope that the opportunities will present themselves so other women can be given the chance to prove themselves as you have done yourself, Miss Cochran.

Miss Cochran. Thank you, Mr. Wilson, but I certainly hope you keep them out of combat and the academies.

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Montgomery?

Mr. Montgomery. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to commend Miss Cochran on a very courageous statement. This is my first time to get to see this charming lady. Thank you very much for testifying before our subcommittee.

I would like to add to your testimony on page 1 where you comment that you have not known of American women participating in combat and further add that a select committee in the Armed Services Committee only recently went to Israel and Egypt, and I don't believe they found in those two countries any women that had participated in combat though they were used in logistics.

Certainly there is no question about it, Israel must have the best fighting Army and the best Air Force in the world, considering their small numbers. They have not used women on combat.

Miss Cochran. They have done a fabulous job with their pilots. I have been there several times.

Mr. Montgomery. Also I have just returned from Southeast Asia and I cannot find where the North Vietnamese, the South Vietnamese, nor the Laotians have used women in combat. In fact, they don't really use them in the logistic forces in the Far East. This would certainly be the first time in the world of using women in combat.

Reminiscing a little, Miss Cochran, the training of the WASPS, was that done near Abilene, Tex.?

Miss Cochran. Yes, it was done in Abilene. The beginning of the program was in Houston, sir, and then we moved it—not Abilene, we moved to Sweetwater, I am sorry.

Mr. Montgomery. That was near Abilene. I was stationed at Camp Barkeley and I believe I had the opportunity to date some of your girls. I just wanted that to be on the record. I am not sure some of them should have gotten married either.

Miss Cochran. You know there has never been a scandal of any kind surrounding any of those women. I took them at 18 and my average age was 22½, and there has never been a derogatory thing said about one of them. Now I am beginning to find out they dated the Congressman.

Mr. Montgomery. Thank you very much for appearing here today.

Miss Cochran. Thank you, sir, for your compliments. I appreciate them greatly.

Mr. Fisher. In regard to the attrition rate that was referred to, to be sure the record is properly understood, you referred to the attrition rate of the WASPS at Sweetwater which, incidentally, is Sammy Baugh's birthplace. You stated that among the WASPS the attrition rate, after training, ran about 36 percent, most of whom resigned to get married.

Miss Cochran. Yes, sir.

Mr. Fisher. Now, I assume the attrition rate during training and prior to the time they completed their training was probably even higher than that, is that correct?

Miss Cochran. Well, it was pretty high because I didn't restrict them. I wanted them to be women first and pilots second, so I let them follow their own inclination in the matter and we had a high attrition rate during the training period too, because I wanted this program run, and I was given permission to run it on that basis, to let the women, except for very strict discipline, do exactly what they wanted to, that were normal things for them to do, which is to get married, and to have a family. And they either wanted to follow that career or they started a family.

Mr. **Fisher**. We are proud of the contribution they made as WASPS and in all the other contributions during the war, in peacetime or what-have-you, and we are very proud to have you here today.

Miss **Cochran**. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank all of you gentlemen for being so kind to me, and Mrs. Holt.

Mr. **Fisher**. I believe that concludes the questioning then. Thank you very much.

Miss **Cochran**. Thank you, sir.

Mr. **Fisher**. This concludes our hearings with reference to the Air Force Academy today, so the committee will now go into executive session.

Mr. **Hogan**. Mr. Chairman, we have several statements for the record.

Mr. **Fisher**. Without objection they may be entered.

[Whereupon, at 11:30 o'clock a.m., the subcommittee proceeded in executive session.]

[The following information was received for the record:]

Written Statement by Hon. Don Edwards, Representative from California

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my words of support for these measures that would eliminate present discriminatory admission practices in the service academies. I am a cosponsor of H.R. 17267 which is identical to the pending bill, H.R. 10705.

The service academies have traditionally provided outstanding educational opportunities to the nation's young men without cost. This has been an important avenue towards successful career opportunities in the services and has, in many cases, been especially important to young men who, because of financial limitations, might not otherwise have such fine educational and career opportunities. The potential importance of the academies to the young women of America is equally compelling.

There has been much complaining from the Pentagon of late about the difficulties in recruiting highly qualified individuals into the services. This is certainly a serious situation for our country, and some have even suggested reinstituting the draft to meet the crisis. However, I find it hard to take these complaints seriously when the Pentagon is apparently unwilling to consider a vast pool of intelligent patriotic young people anxious to serve their country—the young women of America.

The Congress of the United States has made its views on equal rights for men and women totally clear by passage of the Equal Rights Amendment two years ago. In fact, the imminent ratification of that Constitutional Amendment may well overtake legislative efforts to see that the service academies are equally accessible to both young men and women. Numerous challenges to the present admission standards are also on their way through the courts. I am, in fact, a plaintiff in one of these suits.

Present admission policies can be attacked through the courts because they violate the Constitutional guarantees of equal protection under the law and the guarantee of due process of law. Since the law does not require service academies to discriminate against women who apply for admission, it can be forcefully argued that this discrimination by the service academies is totally unauthorized by law. Since the Supreme Court is more and more treating women as a "suspect classification" worthy of protection under the equal protection provisions of the Constitution, I submit that rational arguments for the need for such discrimination cannot be made.

The Defense Department argues that present policies are necessary because, under current law, only men may be assigned to combat zones and because service academies train young *men* for service in combat areas. However, as the Defense Department well knows, only a small number of the careers for which young cadets are trained involve combat. For example, of all the careers for which Air Force cadets may train, only five are combat-related. Does the Defense Department suggest women should be barred from all opportunities as career Air Force Officers because five fields within the Air Force are currently unavailable to them? Of course, this is nonsense. If this is a real Pentagon concern, however, it is time to re-evaluate present policies that allow male citizens of other countries to be educated at *our* service academies without incurring any obligation to serve in our armed forces while we prohibit American women from receiving this same training.

I believe that it is time for Congress to assert leadership in this area. It is embarrassing to me, as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a citizen of the United States, to see our national government promoting and maintaining educational facilities that discriminate against qualified women for essentially frivolous reasons and outmoded patterns of thinking. Because of recent decisions by the Supreme Court, The Federal Government is now in the awkward position of requiring state and private universities to end discriminatory admissions practices, while at the same time allowing its own institutions of higher education these same practices.

We must take affirmative steps to make our academies open to all qualified young people, regardless of race, religion, sex or national origin, and I therefore urge the enactment of this legislation.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL, REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to submit a short statement to this distinguished subcommittee concerning the admission of women to military service academies. Both H.R. 9832 and H.R. 10705 seek to modify Title 10 of the United States Code to eliminate sex discrimination with regard to admission to the academies. By introducing these bills, Mr. Moakley and Mr. DuPont have asked us to face an important question.

Perhaps, as Rep. Stratton indicated in the House debate on S. 2771 on March 18, the issue is a complex one. I hope that these important hearings serve to clarify the question and to make clear what action the Congress should take on these bills.

In my mind, however, two aspects of this issue are already clear. The first involves women in combat roles; the second concerns equal opportunity for women. Both aspects convince me, and will I hope convince others in the Congress, that the reasons for admitting women to the academies far outweigh those for continuing to bar their admission.

In its fight against the attempts in Courts and Congress to secure the admission of women to the academies, the Defense Department argues that devoting a portion of the academies' facilities to women would be an "inappropriate and inefficient" use of public funds. The fundamental mission of service academies, they explain, is to educate and train officers for combat roles. Since women are prevented by statute from serving in combat roles, they would usurp the places (in the academies) of men needed for combat assignments. Unlike many other arguments used against allowing women to attend the academies, this argument makes logical sense. But it has no power to persuade a Congress which passed an Equal Rights Amendment.

By passing that amendment we committed ourselves to the idea that men and women have equal rights and equal responsibilities. As Rep. Bella Abzug said on March 18, women "do not merely want men to help with unpleasant household chores: they want to share with men the unpleasant realities of national defense." The standard example is Israel. And Russian women served as fighter pilots in World War II. If fighting must be done, women should join men in doing it. The record of female officers in the services has been outstanding. It seems to me that in today's world the distinction between combat and non-combat roles is basically irrelevant to the question of admission of women to the service academies. Women should be allowed to serve in any and every military capacity. Some women no doubt conceive combat as their duty. For all female citizens of the U.S., however, combat duty is their right.

Women's rights and responsibilities are equivalent to those of men. Their opportunity for advancement is not now, but must be made, equal. This is the second aspect of the service academy question which forces me to argue against Defense Department pleas. The military has served as a way for blacks to get ahead, to gain an education and a worthwhile career. As another group discriminated against in our society, women should not be deprived of this opportunity for advancement. The volunteer army could provide a way for working women to compete successfully in a discriminatory world. It offers financial advancement: the bill Rep. Schroeder wished to amend to include a provision for the admission of women to the service academies provided for a special pay bonus structure relating to members of the armed forces. Since last year's Supreme Court decision, women in the military have been entitled to equal financial treatment. A commitment by the military to equal treatment of women across the board, including admission to the service academies, would help both women and the volunteer military force. Many women would be eager to join. They would raise the caliber of the force and provide insurance that the military would not become a mere dumping ground but could become a vital, important field of action for the expertise of qualified women.

Arguments for H.R. 9832 and H.R. 10705 must be based on human rights. Arguments against these bills must also face the issue of the rights of citizens in our society. The combat issue argues for, not against, admission of women to the academies, for fundamentally it implies a view of women as unequal, as incapable of defending their country. And I believe, as I hope others do, that women are equal: equal rights, equal responsibilities, equal opportunities. In practical terms, too, the military needs women and women need the military. Both abstract rights and concrete realities argue for admission of women to the service academies.

WRITTEN STATEMENT BY HON. ANTONIO B. WON PAT, DELEGATE, FROM THE TERRITORY OF GUAM

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: I am happy to give my support to legislation which would permit the admission of women to our military academies.

In this day of expanding women's rights, the female members of our society are gradually assuming many duties formerly performed by men, and have proven themselves to be capable and efficient. In all strata of our society and all sectors of our economy, women are filling many positions which have traditionally been the domain of the male sex. Among the areas into which their talents now lead them is the military establishment of our country.

During the past several wars in which the United States was involved, women were a welcome resource to take over many functions so that men could be freed for combat duty. The first women to serve in the military were nurses serving under civilian contract during the Spanish-American War. The first women in the military, other than in the health field, were clerks who served in the Navy during the First World War. Of course, once the war was over, women could no longer be recruited, and the Navy became again an all-male preserve.

The beginning of the Second World War again brought about the need for women in the military services. Congress passed legislation creating the WAC (Women's Army Corps) and the WAVES (Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service). During the war, women proved they could play an important role within the military. As opportunities grew, the number of jobs which women performed increased. By the end of the war, over 265,000 military women had served their country.

It has been said that history repeats itself. In the past, women have been consistently accepted in the military forces only as a last resort. Today, because of the difficulty the Armed Forces are having in filling their quotas for an all-volunteer establishment, it is the women who are filling the ranks of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. Not only are women true volunteers, but they must meet higher standards for admission than men. They must be high school graduates or have an equivalent education, and are accepted from only three out of four mental groups.

Previously, women in the military worked in two main occupation groups: administration, about 67 percent; and health, about 22 percent. Today, the range of occupations open to women is rapidly expanding, and it is likely that as a result more and more women will want to enlist. Women are now doing things such as repairing Air Force planes, operating radios on board ship, taking parachute training, and keep track of foreign satellites.

The number of women in the military services today is 35 percent more than three years ago, and is expected to double by 1978. By Fiscal Year 1975, there are expected to be close to 100,000 women in the Armed Services.

Since women are entering all branches of the military services, and serving with distinction and honor, I feel it is only fitting that they be admitted to the service academies. They have proven that they can perform military duties as well as men, and, in line with our national policy of providing equal opportunities for everyone, they should be permitted to further their careers by obtaining a special education. If they can perform well in the lower echelons, there is no reason why they cannot do well as officers in the highest ranks.

I am proud to say that I have two daughters in the military services. They are both officers and nurses, one in the Air Force, and one in the Army. They enjoy their work, and I believe they are doing a good job.

Passage of the important legislation under discussion today will lead to more opportunities for them and all American women.

Thank you.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS, REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, I wish to extend my appreciation to this subcommittee for holding hearings on the legislation which I have joined as a sponsor and which would allow *all* Americans the right to attend service academies. I feel very strongly that equality of opportunity should be a reality in every aspect of our lives. I regret that it had taken so long to penetrate the military establishment.

With the end of the draft and the move to an all volunteer force, the military cannot continue to close its eyes to what is happening throughout this country. Women are demanding, and rightly so, that they be allowed the same rights as men to become directly involved in the issues of military life and to determine for themselves the part they wish to play. Women do not want to be told their place is one of servitude to the male power structure and that their only role in military life is in support activities for male officers.

Indeed I would not suggest that a woman, or for that matter a man, enter the service academies because I think they would receive a too limited and biased education for I am less than enthusiastic about having anyone trained to accept killing as a so called normal part of life. However, I do strongly believe that this is a decision which should be left to the individuals involved and not dictated by law. I believe that women have the same rights as men to determine for themselves whether this is the kind and quality of life they choose to lead.

To argue over whether women are capable of combat roles or whether the academies can be restructured to house women is to beg the real question. We must all remember that we cannot allow any one segment of our population to be victimized or to victimize for then we all become potential victims of someone's oppression.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF HON. YVONNE B. BURKE, REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pledge my full support for the bill before your subcommittee on the question of admitting women to service academies. As a co-sponsor of this important legislation, I believe the time is long overdue to end the discrimination which has denied women the fair chance to compete equally with men for admission to the service academies.

The argument against allowing women into the academies appears to be based on the fallacious claim of "combat training". The Department of Defense argues that the academies train officers for combat duty when actually less than 15 percent of all Army officers are involved in combat positions. Yet, the military fails to mention the reason for excluding women from the non-combat roles into which 85% of the male academy graduates enter.

Women enter the armed services for the same reasons as men. The sense of patriotism, family tradition, and the opportunity for career advancement motivate both young men and women to consider a military career. The important difference is that women are refused admission to the service academies solely because of their sex. To deny a qualified woman the excellent education and training offered by the academies is highly discriminatory.

A significant step towards occupational equality in the armed services would be achieved by the opening of the academies to women. The integration of men and women with equal military training and education would create a better armed forces. For too long women in this country have had to play the role of the second-class citizen. This legislation creates the opportunity for a woman in the military to benefit from the same education which is presently available to a man.

A current argument against this bill suggests that special facilities of the academies would have to be constructed in order to accommodate women. This position proves to be unfounded when we consider the large number of private universities that have recently become co-educational. The transition in building and utilizing facilities in most cases was made smoothly and easily and the armed services could follow a similar plan to allow the service academies to include women.

Opening the service academies to women would be important in ending the blatant discrimination in the armed forces. This legislation can be effective in allowing fair competition among young men and women for appointments to the service academies. Every citizen, regardless of sex, should be guaranteed the opportunity to serve our country with the best training and education possible. The military academies can provide this background through the passage of this important piece of legislation.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, REPRESENTATIVE FROM WASHINGTON

Mr. Chairman: It is my pleasure to coauthor and support H.R. 11267, which would insure admissions to the service academies without regard to any candidate's sex, race, color or religious beliefs.

Bascially, Mr. Chairman, this legislation and companion bills are designed to allow women to be eligible for admission to the service academies.

The active role and meaningful contributions of women to our military forces become more apparent through time. Yet, career women in the military services are confronted with the Department of Defense's own data which shows that academy-trained officers progress more rapidly—career-wise and pay-wise—than non-academy officers. This sort of impediment certainly should be eliminated.

Today, I am told, some 10 per cent of the membership of the Reserve Officer Training Corps is made up of women. While this is an innovation of itself, their successes are mounting. This is not surprising because we know women make fine leaders and able officers.

Certainly, we are aware that federal law prohibits women serving in combat roles. With ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment, we are told, such laws will be nullified. Even without such Constitutional changes, more than two-thirds of the military jobs and positions are noncombative. Therefore, opportunities within the service are largely extant for women under existing laws, so should be the educational opportunities of the service academies.

It is my belief that the Defense Department is overprotective of women. There is little doubt in my mind that the conflict in Southeast Asia could well have ended more quickly and with positive results if women's genius for management had been utilized by the Pentagon.

Women are capable; they should never be denied opportunity. The country can't afford the loss of woman power, and even admirals and generals will be better advised when allowed the availability of women's intelligence, common sense and management capabilities.

Therefore, my position favoring the admission of women to the service academies in no way reflects a desire for a relaxing of qualifications or for reduction in training. Our national military strength has been built on excellence which these academies have pursued. With women students, there is no need to relax standards, goals or demands. Our nation's leadership deserves the best—without regard to sex, race, color or religious beliefs. When we manifest such quality in opportunity, democracy and our National goals will be better served.

Written Statement of Hon. William D. Hathaway, Senator From Maine

The subject at issue in these hearings is quite easily stated. The best military training in the world takes place at the American Service Academies. This training is available for men, some of whom are not even American citizens. It is not available for American women, no matter how dedicated or how well qualified they may be.

The service academies have never satisfactorily explained the reason for this discriminatory policy. They say it is because the mission of the academies is combat training, but most of the training which takes place at the academies is not combat related, and no reason has ever been advanced as to why women are not allowed to receive academy training for the non-combat roles they have been filling for many years. The Department of Defense made the following statement in its report on S. 2351, my bill in the Senate to allow women to be admitted to the academies:

"There are numerous officer billets in the armed services, other than in combat roles which are necessary to the effectiveness of the military services. Competence in these positions is no less important than in combat roles."

Surely the best training for these non-combat roles is also to be found at the service academies. For the good of morale of the service, as well as because of our own beliefs, that training should be equally available to all.

The second reason most often given for excluding women is the expense of remodeling the facilities to accommodate them, but women have been accommodated in the regular army without any particularly burdensome expense. Furthermore, any remodeling expense would be trifling compared to the overall cost of operating the academies.

As I mentioned, I have introduced a bill in the Senate that would allow women to be admitted to the service academies. This bill was introduced last summer, and passed the Senate without opposition in December as an amendment to S. 2771, the enlistment bonus bill. The other cosponsors of this amendment were Senators Thurmond, Javits and Mansfield, and the amendment had the active support of Senator John Stennis, the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Thus, the amendment had the active support of both the chairman and the ranking Republican of that committee. That amendment was deleted from S. 2771 in the House Armed Services Committee by a margin of one vote under circumstances which gave rise to exasperation on the part of some of the members of that committee.

I have recently introduced a substitute amendment to my original bill which contains some technical changes. This amendment already has the support of a large number of Senators, including Senators Dominick, Jackson, Goldwater, Nunn, and Hughes, all of whom are on the Senate Armed Services Committee, as well as the original co-sponsors of the amendment to S. 2771.

We have removed discrimination in many other areas. It is time to remove it in this area as well.

Written Statement of Hon. Lawrence J. Hogan, Representative From Maryland

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to advise this distinguished committee of my strong support for legislation being considered here today to grant women the right of admission to America's armed service academies.

As the members of this committee certainly know, the American woman in recent years has been actively seeking equality in this country.

The passage of the Equal Rights Amendment by the Congress in 1972 gave impetus to this movement, and it placed the Congress solidly on record as endorsing the fundamental principle that women should not be either unduly favored or unduly handicapped in a legal sense simply because of their gender.

The armed services have responded in a very positive way to this effort toward equality, with an accelerated incidence of promotion of women to the highest ranks of leadership; a diversified choice of military careers for women, including pilot training and ROTC eligibility; a growing number of women in strategic command and support positions; and the opening of one—but only one—of the service academies, the Merchant Marine Academy, to female applicants.

All of this points to an anachronism which this legislation would put to rest: the outdated and unjust policy of limiting entrance to the three other service academies to men only.

In January of 1973, a young lady from my congressional district sought my help in securing for her an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis. I was disappointed and upset that I had to reply that women were not eligible for admission to the academies.

I made clear to the young lady that I disagreed with this policy, but that is small comfort to someone whose love for her country—so great that she would seek to dedicate her career to its service—was rewarded with an inflexible "no women need apply" policy that frustrated her ambition and may well have marred her respect for the system she had so earnestly wanted to serve and defend.

Beyond this basic question of fairness, there is an equally important question of why we should continue to squander the talents and resources of more than half this country's population simply because they are women.

There is no justifiable answer to either question. Tradition is not justification—it is an excuse. The alleged emphasis on combat training in the academies is not justification—too many academy graduates have found themselves in other areas of military service. The cost of converting facilities to accommodate women cadets is not justification—neither the cost nor the conversion need be very extensive.

The fact of the matter is that there is really no justification at all for maintaining our service academies as the last outposts of discrimination, the last bastions of outmoded tradition.

As long as we have women officers in the military, we should provide them with the same high quality of training that we provide to male officers. There is every justification for opening the academy doors to the talented, dedicated and courageous women who have knocked on those doors in the past but in vain.

We have the opportunity, through passage of this legislation, to correct these inequities and these injustices, and to bring to the armed service academies not just a new breed of cadet, but a new and higher standard of military service.

I respectfully and strongly urge this committee to act with favor and with dispatch on this very important legislation.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR., REPRESENTATIVE FROM PENNSYLVANIA

ADMISSION OF WOMEN TO THE MILITARY ACADEMIES

Mr. Chairman, Thank you very much for allowing me to address your Subcommittee on the issue of whether women should be allowed admission to our military academies.

This Subcommittee must decide if our country will continue to discriminate against over fifty percent of our population by prohibiting any segment of that population wishing to pursue military careers by obtaining a military academy education.

As co-sponsor of one of the bills this Subcommittee is reviewing, I would like to share with you the situation which prompted me to take this action.

A 17-year old woman from my district wanted a military career. Before she contacted my office, she did what many military spokesmen have suggested that women who wish a military career do: she looked into the possibility of an Air Force ROTC scholarship.

This young lady wanted to work in either the intelligence or foreign service fields. She accepted the fact that her eyes were not good enough to become a pilot or a navigator, but she decided she wanted to serve [illegible] country in the same manner as any man could.

The Air Force, even before learning about her eyes, however, flatly turned her down stating that the four year scholarship program "is open only to *male* applicants that can qualify for pilot or navigator training." Please note the requirement is only that they can qualify, not that once they are accepted they must fill one of these positions.

This woman would neither accept this decision nor the rationale on which it was based. Instead, she wrote my office stating that she had learned I was accepting applications from women to the military academies. I selected her as my fourth alternate to the Air Force Academy having been impressed with her 4.5 grade average in high school and her extracurricular activities.

Her application was "returned without action" by the Air Force Academy "because Air Force policy limits admission to males only". The same letter also pointed out that Air Force ROTC programs are open to both men and women and suggested that she look into one of these.

She has since looked into the one Air Force ROTC program that is still open to her. That program requires her to participate for two years in ROTC training before the Air Force will even partially subsidize her education.

Congress made its feelings on sex discrimination clear when it passed the Equal Rights Amendment. Though this is not as yet part of the law of the land, it demonstrates the view of Congress. Although many still stand by a traditional societal role for women, I feel that the proposed 27th Amendment is more in accordance with the true feelings of the people.

I feel an example of this can be seen by looking at my home state of Pennsylvania which adopted an "Equal Rights Amendment" to its state Constitution in 1971. This law providing equal rights under the law without denial or abridgement because of sex passed by a two to one vote when the issue was placed before the voters.

Many of the witnesses before this Subcommittee have testified that the basic purpose of the military academies is to ready its graduates for combat. This is a role they point out women cannot under the law presently hold. Others have also stated that if women would be allowed to attend the academies, it would have a disruptive effect on the flow of male graduates into the branches of the military, since some time would have to be taken up converting a system that has for so long been for males only, to one for both sexes.

Miss Jacqueline Cochran, who has testified, was one of those to hold such views and I ask if individuals like Miss Cochran are not the very types of persons the military wishes to attract. She is a very courageous person. She was fired upon while transporting bombers across the English Channel in World War Two and has piloted many types of aircraft since then. She is a good example of the type of women who would be available for key leadership roles if the sex barriers at the academies were dropped.

I would also like to point out that the academies are not strictly upholding what is their self-proclaimed basic purpose of turning out combat-ready officers. It is true that all males are trained in combat techniques, but a large percentage in each academy does not fulfill such a role after graduation.

Last year 253 of 834, or 30 percent, of the Air Force graduates were not assigned to combat roles, 162 of the 899 commissioned graduates (18%) of West Point were were not, and over 200 of the 888 Annapolis graduates (about 23%) were not. I feel these statistics verify the observation that we are offering some men a highly specialized military education—though they may never use all the skills they have learned—while we refuse to allow women to qualify for any of these skills. Yet combat or noncombat roles is not the real issue. The issue is equality of opportunity for all the nation's citizens.

While on the one hand the Armed Services are increasing their drive to enlist women in the military, on the other hand they turn them away from their best leadership schools. Few women have risen above the level of Lieutenant Colonel. In fact, in any given year the average number of women above Lieutenant Colonel is less than thirty in all branches of the military. Their male counterparts, meanwhile, number in the thousands. If women are good enough to recruit, aren't they good enough to receive the finest training?

The Air Force has written me stating they have contingency plans when and if Congress authorizes them to accept women into the academy, but what effect will its current double standard have on its efforts to increase female enlistment to its goal of 9,000 women by the end of the year? And what about the effect on the almost 7,000 women the Navy hopes to attract by the end of the year or the effect on the 16,000 women the Army hopes will be in its ranks?

I also must question why the military is preventing those women who still choose to become officers the best possible education in their field. We are saying that women do not qualify for the same level of leadership as men do. Women are now able to enter 434 of the Army's 482 skill classifications, but if a woman chooses to become an officer in these ranks, she cannot receive the best military education possible that her male counterpart is able to obtain.

I want to thank you again for allowing me to address this important matter before this Subcommittee.

Written Statement of Hon. Elizabeth Holtzman, Representative From New York

WOMEN IN OUR MILITARY ACADEMIES

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to make a brief statement before the Military Personnel Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee on H.R. 10705, a bill which would allow women to attend our service academies.

Throughout our history women have entered the ranks of military service on their own accord. Currently they fill 44 positions in the Army, 98 in the Navy, and 220 in the Air Force. Women have proven themselves capable of handling all of these non-combat jobs and handling them well. By denying women admission to the academies we are discouraging women from entering the top levels of command, and we are thereby depriving our country and its military services of the talents of competent and able persons.

It is no answer to say that women can enter the officer program through commission in the Reserve Officer Training Program or the Officers Candidate Service. Few people would seriously contend that graduation from a prestigious military academy is comparable to achieving the rank of officer through one of these alternative methods. First, it takes years for an R.O.T.C. or O.C.S. officer to catch up to an academy graduate, simply because the former receive only a smattering of professional training compared to intensive military programs at the academies. Second, the higher one goes in the military ranks, the greater is the percentage of academy graduates who fill those ranks. And third, it is a dual standard to allow women to become officers only through R.O.T.C., while men are allowed to enter both the R.O.T.C. program and the military academies. Since women are considered to be officer material, it is indeed discriminatory that they are not granted the opportunity to obtain the same education and consideration for military advancement as are men.

It is disheartening to note the hollowness of the arguments that have been advanced by the Department of Defense and the service branches to continue the present policy of discriminating against women in the academies. The military's major justification for prohibiting women from attending the academies is that the primary mission of these institutions is to train men as combat leaders to assume tactical responsibilities and positions. The Department of Defense maintains that because women are not allowed to serve in certain combat roles, the curriculum at the service academies would in large part be wasted on them.

This argument is specious. Recently, the House passed a resolution which allowed a foreign national, a Laotian, to be admitted to West Point. At present there are a number of aliens attending this particular Academy. These young men will probably never bear allegiance to the United States or serve in a combat capacity in the United States Army. How can we in good conscience permit these foreign nationals to enter a military academy while still denying admission to American women?

Furthermore, the service academies are not maintained for the primary purpose of training combat soldiers. They are maintained to train the most qualified young men for military leadership positions. As has been demonstrated time and time again, women are equally well qualified for these positions. The Air Force has a woman as commander of a major United States' military unit. There are several women generals, a woman admiral, and a woman in the Army who is in command of male troops overseas. Much to its credit, the Merchant Marine Academy recently opened its doors to women candidates.

Together the services claim that the curriculum would have to be altered, the facilities changed, and quotas instituted if women are allowed to enter the academies. The hollowness of these claims is shown by the experience of the formerly all-male institutions such as the Armed Forces Staff College, the Command and General Staff College of the Army, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the Army War College, which are now all open to women. The cost of converting these institutions was slight compared to the benefits reaped by both the female enrollees and the United States Armed Forces.

The real question remains, *are we ready to send men into combat commanded by women?* Or, are we only willing to send women to the front lines as nurses and aides and not in an officer's position?

We are not asking that women be given separate courses and facilities. We are not asking that the academies lower their standards or institute a quota system for admitting women. All that we ask is that women be granted the same opportunity as men to compete for admission—on the basis of merit—to the United States Military Academies.

We ask this because it is right. We have all seen institutions which, while formerly all-male, have readily adjusted to their new co-educational status. A few years ago, objections were voiced over admitting girls to the Capitol Page Service. It was maintained that the hours were too long, the work too strenuous, and the facilities inadequate for young women. We have seen how these misconceptions have been exposed and proven wrong. We will see how similar misconceptions evaporate when women are finally admitted to the military academies.

Women today successfully fill positions in the police department; they work as telephone repairmen and pole climbers, construction workers, and firemen. Women can equally and successfully play a leadership role in the Armed Forces. We should begin the process of encouraging qualified women to enter and serve the ranks of officers by allowing women to enter the United States military academies. By denying our Armed Forces the benefit of their talent, we make our country the loser.

Written Statement of Hon. Barbara Jordan, Representative From Texas

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify on behalf of H.R. 11267 and similar bills which would "insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color or religious beliefs."

In response to my requests for information on the subject, the Army, Navy and Air Force have replied that they are opposed to the admission of women to their respective service academies for two reasons. First, since women are prohibited from serving in combat missions and since the curriculum of the academies is primarily designed to train officers for combat, it would not be "cost beneficial" to admit women. Second, existing facilities are not designed for women. Should women be admitted extensive remodeling would be necessary.

Is the primary mission of the service academies to train officers for combat missions? If true, one would never know from the curricula or reading the academy catalogues. Each academy offers a core curricula. Quoting from the West Point Catalogue: "The core program contains the elements of a broad, general education and is designed to give the cadet a fundamental knowledge of the arts and sciences." The subjects offered as part of the core program do not distinguish the service academies from most any public or private liberal arts college or university.

The academies also offer elective programs from which the student can choose a specialty. None of the specialties offered includes specific training for combat readiness. Indeed, most all elective programs offered at the academies are also offered at existing civilian colleges and universities in departments of engineering, science, humanities, and social sciences.

If the academies offered degrees in military science or if their curricular were focused on military tactics, I could understand the phrase "the primary mission of the academies is to train officers for combat." A review of the current curricula of the academies does not support the contention that the primary mission of the academies is to train officers for combat.

If for argument's sake, one accepted the Defense Department's premise that the primary mission of the academies is to train officers for combat, one is still unconvinced that women have no place at the academies. Only 15% of Army officer positions are classified by the Defense Department as combat positions. The remainder are administrative, scientific, back-up and logistical positions. These positions could well be filled by female officers. Women make up 10% of the enrollment in the ROTC programs.

Surely the Defense Department does not believe the purpose of the ROTC program is to train officers exclusively for non-combat. If women can be trained for officer positions through ROTC, why is the training at the academies so sacrosanct?

The second major argument used by the academies in opposition to admitting women is that extensive remodeling will have to be done to their facilities before the admission of women can take place. No one doubts that some remodeling might have to be accomplished. But I would not think the costs would be prohibitive. At most, the dormitories would have to be partitioned, and additional sanitary facilities added. But women do not require new dining halls, new classrooms, new athletic facilities. I anticipate that the remodeling costs will be minimal.

I support legislation before the committee to insure women can be admitted to the service academies because I sincerely believe that there is a genuine demand by some women for the high calibre education only the service academies offer.

Women want to go to the service academies for the same reasons men do—they are interested in a military career. We should not automatically relegate their desires to a second class military career. We do not tolerate second class lawyers or doctors. Those women who wish to pursue a military career should be given the opportunity to qualify for a first class military career; to go first class and be admitted to the service academy of their choice.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN H. DENT, REPRESENTATIVE FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee: I appreciate the opportunity to submit my testimony in support of the admission of women to the service academies.

I believe that by doing so we reaffirm the dignity and individuality which is the right of each human being. To be judged on the basis of sex alone defeats our American heritage of equality and freedom granted to all.

A young woman from my district, Airman Terri Ann Ponzetti has written me asking that I consider her for a nomination to the Air Force Academy. I am, of course, happy to do so. In her first attempt to gain admission to the Air Force Academy, she was denied, purely on the basis of sex.

I am reluctant to think that a woman with her outstanding characteristics and sincere dedication would be denied equal consideration, simply because traditional policies restrict admission to males only.

After graduation from high school, Amn. Ponzetti enlisted in the Air Force completed basic training, and attended Jet Engine Mechanic School, where she became the third women in the entire Air Force to complete the Jet Engine Mechanic Course. She graduated first in her class, with honors and a 98 average. She is well aware of the difficulties she faces in her quest to pursue a meaningful career with the Air Force, but her dedication is strong and her capabilities are many.

I feel confident that she could unquestionably accept the responsibilities and challenges afforded to her male counterparts.

It remains my conviction that the Congress must act honorably to end discrimination on the basis of sex in the military academies. We have indicated our intent by the passage of the Equal Rights amendment, and inasmuch as that amendment has yet to be ratified, we, as a Body, should move to rectify additional injustices. The Merchant Marine Academy stands as a leader in accepting women and deserves recognition for doing so. I would hope that the other Academies would follow their example.

I am submitting, for the Record, correspondence which significantly describes the events relative to Amn. Ponzetti's case. I would call your special attention to the letters of recommendation submitted by her immediate supervisors, Master Sergeant Joseph M. Rey, USAF, Lieutenant Colonel David M. Williams, USAF, Captain Patricia A. Phelps, USAF, and Colonel Guy D. Perham, USAF.

CORRESPONDENCE

JANUARY 15, 1974.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENT: I doubt if you would remember me, but a few years ago, I sent you a petition supporting Apollo 17. Your genuine interest, forwarding my letter to NASA and answering me, is a rarity among such busy men as yourself. The fact that you helped me then makes me write to you now.

I am now 19 years old, a woman in the United States Air Force. I am currently stationed at March AFB, California, as a jet engine mechanic for SAC's KC-135 tankers. I love my job here and had no problems entering an "all male" field, being the 3rd woman jet engine machanic in the Air Force and the first in the Strategic Air Command.

My true dream is flying and I would like to get a college degree. I love the Air Force and so would be and honored if I could receive my degree through the Air Force Academy.

I have sent in my applications already. However I realize that they are not accepting women. From my experiences here already, I realize how hard it is to get someone to help back me.

Congressman Dent, I'm asking for your help, any way you can. I am no "woman's libber" and I am very sincere in my quests. I realize other academies are open to women, but my heart will always be with the United States Air Force. My first sergeant encouraged me to write to you since I couldn't see you over Christmas.

I'd appreciate your support. The Air Force is like my family, I'd hate to, take them to court, or fight them. That's why I sincerely hope that I can show them somehow, with your help, that I'm sincere; and women can and should be allowed to attend the Air Force Academy. How I appreciate your time, sir, and have a real nice day! God bless you!

Sincerely yours,

AMN. TERRI ANN PONZETTI.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE.

DEAR SIR. As a member of the Regular Air Force, I have come to know a truly fulfilling life. A life holding enough responsibility to make me professional and enough pleasure to make me enjoy everyday living to its fullest degree. I want this to be my life for a long time. I want to stay a part of the United States Air Force.

As a high school graduate, I had big plans for college. I applied and was accepted at Clarion State College, Pennsylvania. My love for aeronautics, which began with the flight of Apollo 11, was becoming almost an obsession, and a book I had read on the United States Air Force had opened my mind to dreams.

I encouraged my brother to enlist, and I went to take my test, even though I still planned on college; because a degree, I felt, was the only way to really get involved in aeronautics.

The Air Force, too, became an obsession. Four years seemed so long to wait to become a part of it. Finally I decided to enlist, promising my dad that I would someday be a college graduate. I took a guaranteed job as a jet engine mechanic; a job I chose after careful consideration. A job I love today.

At Chanute Air Force Base, I was the third WAF to "invade" the school. I worked hard, to prove a point and to realize a dream. I graduated number one in my class of thirteen guys, with a 98 average, but my biggst achievement was making instructors and students alike realize that a girl could indeed make it in the field. Their encouragement and genuine friendship thrilled me.

Why do I want to be an officer? Part of it is to become more involved in the fascinating world of aeronautics. But more importantly I want to help keep my Air Force sound. I want to be in a position where I can not only help and encourage the fine men and women of the Air Force, but also eliminate the bad. I want to be in a position where I can see that things are done, and done right. I want to see that people are treated as they deserve to be treated; fairly and equally.

I am applying to the Academy not to break a "men's" barrier but because I realize so much the value of its education. I have no longing to be the same as a man; I'd only like the right to this education. Some people say that there are problems that must be worked out before women can enter an all male organization. But no problem is so big that it cannot be remedied. As with all new projects I'll need help and support. I hope that you can see things through my eyes. If men and women of the United States Air Force are to be treated fairly then here is where to start. I do not fear failure or hard work; I only fear being denied the opportunity to try.

I urge you to think about my application. I would be so proud, so honored, to receive my degree from the Air Force Academy.

I will continue to do my small part for the Air Force, when I took my oath of enlistment I promised to serve my country faithfully "so help me, God". He has yet to fail me!

Thank you so very much for all your time and attention!

Sincerely yours,

AMN. TERRI A. PONZETTI.

0884

APPLICATION FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY UNDER QUOTA ALLOTTED TO ENLISTED MEN OF THE REGULAR AND RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE AIR FORCE

I HEREBY MAKE APPLICATION FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE USAF ACADEMY UNDER QUOTA ALLOTTED TO ENLISTED MEN OF THE REGULAR AND RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE AIR FORCE IAW THE PROVISIONS OF AFRs 53-10 AND 53-14. *(Submit in triplicate)*

(Check the appropriate box)

☑ REGULAR AIR FORCE ☐ AIR NATIONAL GUARD ☐ AIR FORCE RESERVE

THIS SPACE IS FOR AIRMAN CLASSIFICATION TEST SCORES ONLY.[1]
GEN. ____
ADMIN. ____
MECH. ____
ELEC. ____

1. LAST NAME - FIRST NAME - MIDDLE NAME *(Print or type)*: Ponzetti Terri Ann

2. GRADE: Amn.

3. SERVICE NO. AND SSAN: FR177465785

4. COMPLETE SERVICE ADDRESS *(Include Major Command and Zip Code)*:
FSC Box 2473 Strategic Air Command
March AFB, California, 92507

5. BIRTH DATE: 14 October 54

6. COMPLETE HOME ADDRESS *(No. and Street or R.F.D. No., City or Town, State and Zip Code)*:
723 Scott Avenue
Jeannette, Pennsylvania, 15644

7. PLACE OF BIRTH *(City or Town, County and State)*: Greensburg, Westmoreland County, Penna.

8. U.S. CITIZENSHIP: ☑ BIRTH ☐ NATURALIZATION

9. MARITAL STATUS *(Existing marriage or previous marriage, whether dissolved by divorce, death or annulment is disqualifying for admission to the Air Force Academy)*
☑ SINGLE *(Never married)* ☐ MARRIED ☐ ANNULMENT ☐ DIVORCED

10. EDUCATION

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE[2]	ATTENDED PREP SCHOOL[2]	ATTENDED COLLEGE[2]	COMPLETED		
		one course at night school.	YEARS OF HIGH SCHOOL	QUARTERS OF COLLEGE	SEMESTERS OF COLLEGE
☑ YES ☐ NO	☐ YES ☑ NO	☐ YES ☑ NO	12		

11. MILITARY SERVICE

A. MY TOTAL LENGTH OF AIR FORCE ENLISTED SERVICE IS 13 MONTHS AS OF THIS DATE *(Include service with Air Force regular component, Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard)* [illegible]

B. ☑ I AM NOW ON ACTIVE DUTY WITH REGULAR AIR FORCE

C. ☐ I AM NOW ACTIVELY PARTICIPATING IN THE ☐ AF RESERVE ☐ AIR NATIONAL GUARD

D. ☐ I AM NOW ON ACTIVE DUTY IN TRAINING STATUS WITH ☐ AF RESERVE ☐ AIR NATIONAL GUARD

E. MY CURRENT ENLISTMENT BEGAN DAY 23 MONTH 27 YEAR 73 (In Reserves 17 Oct 72)

F. MY CURRENT ENLISTMENT IS SCHEDULED TO TERMINATE DAY [illegible] MONTH [illegible] YEAR [illegible]

12. CONSIDERATION FOR THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY PREPARATORY SCHOOL *(Check the appropriate boxes)*

A. ☐ I DESIRE TO BE CONSIDERED FOR THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY PREPARATORY SCHOOL PRIOR TO COMPETING FOR THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY. *(See para. 5, AFR 53-14 for application deadline date.)*

B. ☑ I DESIRE TO MAKE DIRECT APPLICATION FOR THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY. IF I AM NOT APPOINTED AND AM QUALIFIED, I WISH TO BE CONSIDERED FOR THE ACADEMY PREPARATORY SCHOOL WHEN ITS NEXT CLASS IS SELECTED. *(See para. 6, AFR 53-10 for direct application deadline date.)*

C. I DESIRE TO ATTEND THE AFA PREPARATORY SCHOOL AND THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: *(Use reverse if necessary)* I realize the value of this education. And I also know the results of hard work and intense training. In basic training I was taught the value of self-discipline. At the Academy I could continue to receive the education and training I need to become a valuable asset to the Air Force and to my country as well.

CERTIFICATE

(All Applicants)

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING STATEMENTS ARE TRUE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF. I DESIRE A MILITARY CAREER AND TO BECOME A CADET AT THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY.

DATE:

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT: Terri Ann Ponzetti

[1] Only Air Force Test Control Officers or Organization Commanders are authorized to enter applicant's test score in this space. Entries will be made in ink or by typewriter.

[2] Transcripts must be submitted for all High School, Preparatory School, and Colleges attended.

AF FORM JUN 63 1786 PREVIOUS EDITION OF THIS FORM WILL BE USED UNTIL STOCK IS EXHAUSTED.

January 24, 1974.

Amn. Terri Ann Ponzetti,
PSC Box 2473,
March AFB, California 92508.

Dear Terri: I read with great interest your letter concerning your desire for a nomination to the United States Air Force Academy.

I am in hearty agreement with you when you point out the importance of women being allowed to attend the Air Force Academy. I sincerely regret that you have expressed your desire to attend the Academy at this late date. My nominations to the Academies for this year have already been made. I will be more than happy to consider you as a nominee to the Academy for the class of 1975.

If you wish to apply, please contact me in April or May of 1974 and I will send you all the necessary application forms at that time. I look forward to hearing from you.

With every kind regard, I am

Sincerely yours,

John H. Dent, M.C.

January 25, 1974.

Dear Congressman Dent: Recently I applied to the Air Force Academy. Enclosed is a copy of the answer I received. I am so proud to be in the U.S. Air Force; but I was truly hurt by the attitude of the directors of the Air Force Academy. I have taken several steps to get some action taken about this refusal to my application. I feel that I have been discriminated against. I firmly believe that the Air Force cannot honestly proclaim to practice equal opportunity if applicants to the Academy are turned down because of their sex.

I sincerely hope that you, as my congressman, will further help me in pursuing this issue. I wish to do everything I can to really get equal opportunity in the Air Force. Once again I must thank you for your time and attention. Have a nice day!

Sincerely,

Amn. Terri A. Ponzetti.

Department of the Air Force
Director of Admissions and Registrar,
USAF Academy, Colo., 22 January 1974.

Airman Terri Ann Ponzetti,
PSC Box 2473,
March AFB, CA 92508.

Dear Airman Ponzetti: I regret to inform you that you are not eligible for admission to the Air Force Academy because admission is currently limited to males. Therefore, no action will be taken on your application.

Should females become eligible for admission to the Air Force Academy in the future, it will be widely publicized and you will have the opportunity to seek admission at that time provided you are within the age limit.

Your interest in the Air Force Academy is appreciated, and I regret that we could not favorably consider your application.

Sincerely,

Jerry D. Jackson,
Lt. Colonel, USAF, Associate Director of Admissions.

February 1, 1974.

Ms. Terri Ann Ponzetti,
PSC Box 2473,
March AFB, CA 92508.

Dear Terri: I am sorry to hear about your experience with the Air Force Academy. Nevertheless, as I stated in my last letter, should you wish to apply for the class of '75, I will, of course, consider you for nomination, regardless of present Air Force policy. There is considerable reason to believe that the Academies will revise their standards.

In that regard, I have written to Lt. Colonel Jackson, Associate Director of Admissions, and advised him of my intent to nominate you. I have enclosed a copy of that letter for your information.

I am happy to have been of service in this matter, and if I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

With every good wish, I remain

Sincerely yours,

John H. Dent, M.C.

Jeannette, Pa., *February 9, 1974.*

Hon. John H. Dent.

Dear Sir: Our sincere thanks to you for taking the time to help our daughter AMN. Terri Ann Ponzetti gain admission to the United States Air Force Academy.

She is very dedicated and devoted to the United States Air Force and our country, and hopes to make them both proud of her someday.

With the help of God, and people such as yourself, we're sure that she will succeed.

Gratefully yours,

Mr. & Mrs. Paul E. Ponzetti.

February 25, 1974.

Mr. & Mrs. Paul E. Ponzetti,
723 Scott Avenue,
Jeannette, Pa. 15644.

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Ponzetti: Thank you for your recent letter expressing your appreciation in behalf of your daughter Terri.

I can assure you that I will try my best to get Terri nominated to the Air Force Academy. She is a truly outstanding young woman, of whom, I am sure, you are quite proud.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

John H. Dent, M.C.

February 1, 1974.

Lt. Col. Jerry D. Jackson,
Associate Director of Admissions, Department of the Air Force,
USAF Academy, Colo. 80840.

Dear Lt. Colonel Jackson: This letter is in behalf a constituent of mine, Amn. Terri Ann Ponzetti, who has indicated to you an interest in attending the Air Force Academy. She has advised me that because of present policy regarding females, she has been declared ineligible for admission.

It is my understanding that the Academies are currently revising their all male status, and in that regard, I would like to indicate at this time my intent to nominate Amn. Ponzetti from this office for the Class of '75. I have reviewed her record, (a copy of which I've enclosed) and it is exemplary. To deny women admission to the Academies violates the fundamental heritage or equality that makes the United States the most free country in the world.

I respectfully request your total support in reviewing Air Force Academy eligibility requirements that deny admission on the basis of sex.

With every kind regard, I am

Sincerely yours,

John H. Dent, M.C.

Enclosure.

Department of the Air Force
Headquarters United States Air Force,
Washington, D.C., March 12 1974.

Hon. John H. Dent,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Dent: Your letter to Lieutenant Colonel Jerry D. Jackson, Associate Director of Admissions, Air Force Academy, dated Feburary 1, 1974, concerning the interest of Airman Terri Ann Ponzetti in attending the Air Force Academy has been referred to this Headquarters for reply.

The issue of the admission of women to the service academies raises specific questions of national policy. The service academies have as their fundamental mission the education and training of officers. Such training must first and foremost prepare the academy graduate for the combat role he may be called upon to fulfill. Federal law limits the availability of women to fulfill certain combat roles. Therefore, the question of whether women should be admitted to the academies and assigned to combat roles is a matter of both public policy and legislative decision.

We are aware of a difference of opinion among the members of Congress as to whether women should be accommodated at the service academies. Some feel that it was not contemplated at the time the existing authority for the academies was enacted and therefore requires further Congressional action. Although the Congress has stated its position on the Equal Rights Amendment, it is not clear that the Congress intended the same position to apply to the specific question of admission of women to the service academies. We believe the will of Congress in this matter, if contrary to our policy, could be expressed by appropriate changes to the law.

As you know, several bills have been introduced during the 93rd Congress to permit the admission of women to the service academies. On 20 December 1973, the Senate agreed to an amendment to S. 2771 offered by Senator Hathaway which would accomplish this purpose. The House has not yet acted on S. 2771.

The Air Force has done some contingency planning; and if the law is changed in the relatively near future, we could be ready to admit women by July 1975. This lead time is necessary for the Air Force to make appropriate facility and other necessary changes. You may be sure that should the law be changed allowing the admission of women to the Academy next year, Airman Ponzetti will be given every opportunity for appointment consistent with her overall qualifications on the required examinations.

Sincerely

OLIVER W. LEWIS,
Maj. Gen. USAF,
Director, Directorate of Personnel Programs.

MARCH 10, 1974.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing copies of two letters I received in answer to my question of why I was being discriminated against in my efforts to gain admission to the Air Force Academy.

It seems to me that the Academy is blaming Congress for its closed doors. Yet when I write to my Congressmen and Senators, they seem to be in favor of equal opportunity.

I would like to know how Congress stands on this issue since the other Academies are open to women. It seems only reasonable that the Air Force Academy, too, should open its doors since women have *always* been a part of the Air Force, since its beginning.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely yours,

A/C TERRI A. PONZETTI.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
HEADQUARTERS STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND,
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., February 7, 1974.

Airman TERRI ANN PONZETTI,
PSC Box 2473,
March AFB CA 92508.

DEAR AIRMAN PONZETTI: It is encouraging to see our young airmen, people such as yourself, with the motivation and desire to progress to the best of their ability. Your effort to secure an appointment to the United States Air Force Academy is indicative of the spirit of all who have accepted a challenge wherever it was found.

Women in the Air Force have made significant gains and have greatly contributed to our overall capability to maintain world peace. Career opportunities have increased, and with the exception of limitations imposed by law which preclude direct involvement in combat duties, women have accepted the challenge and performed well. Today the academies are open only to males. We would encourage the Congress, if they desire, to appoint women to these institutions. Of course, Congress would also have the responsibility to appropriate the funds and the construction money for female dormitories and other facilities. Former Secretary of Defense Laird called upon the services to open their doors fully to women. Progress has been and will continue to be made in this area.

Today, however, admittance of women to our service academies is prohibited. Yet there is cause for hope. There are many other ways for you to receive a college degree and commissioning as an officer. Educational opportunities are available at March AFB for you to further pursue your academic and career goals. Seek out the opportunities, accept the responsibility, perform with excellence and your goals will be achieved. I extend my personal wishes for your future success.

Sincerely,

BILLY J. ELLIS,
Major General, USAF,
Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1974.

Airman TERRI ANN PONZETTI,
PSC Box 2473,
March AFB, California 92508.

DEAR AIRMAN PONZETTI: Women are not presently being accepted for admission to the Air Force Academy. This policy is based on our belief that this is the intent of Congress, which is the primary source for nominating applicants. If and when Congress makes it clear that the Air Force should admit women to the Academy, we will be ready to do so. Such a decision will receive immediate, widespread publicity.

It would be to your advantage to seek other alternatives in achieving your educational goals. I suggest you look into the Airman Education Commissioning Program and begin taking courses for an aeronautical engineering degree. In the event that women may become eligible candidates for the Academy, you may, with the additional courses, be better qualified and have a more competitive position for selection.

I wish you continued success in your Air Force career.

Sincerely,

LUCIUS THEUS,
Brigadier General, USAF,
Special Assistant for Social Actions Directorate of Personnel Plans.

MARCH 20, 1974.

Ms. TERRI ANN PONZETTI,
PSC Box 2473,
March AFB, CA 92508.

DEAR TERRI: As you may know, S. 2771 (a bill to revise special pay bonus structure relating to members of the armed forces) passed the House on Monday. Included in the bill was an amendment which allowed admission of women to the service academies. The Committee on Armed Services deleted the amendment believing the matter of women in service academies should be subject to full study at separate hearings. Inasmuch as no hearings have been held to date, rest assured that I will advise my colleague, Chairman Edward Hébert, that I support women being admitted to service academies. In the meantime, we will continue to pursue your entrance to the Air Force Academy.

With every kind regard, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT, M.C.

JUNE 5, 1974.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENT: I realize as busy as you are, you probably do not have much time for, should I say, "fan mail". Yet I would like for you to know how very much I appreciate the support you have given me.

Regardless of the outcome, it is my hope to continue my education in the field of aeronautics and to serve the U.S.A.F.

Although the Air Force has a way to go on equal opportunity for women; in combat zones, alert facilities, flying etc., I take pride in being an airman. I feel sure that in given time the Air Force will change realizing that a lot of women, like myself, do not want to be "men's barrier breakers". We only want a chance to serve our country, our Air Force to the *fullest* extent possible. We do not want to be "special" or "exceptions to the rule". We want to be *true* members of the Air Force.

It is through people like you, Congressman Dent, that changes are made. I only hope that if I am in a responsible position some day, I will have both the knowledge and courage, as you have to stand up for what I feel is right or needs changed.

I sincerely thank you again for your interest and support.

A/C Terri A. Ponzetti.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From: 22FMS/MAD.
Subject: Letter of Recommendation—A1C Terri A. Ponzetti.
To: John H. Dent, Congressman 21st District, Pennsylvania.

It is my distinct pleasure and privilege to be associated with A1C Ponzetti. Working with and for me, she consistently displays outstanding cooperation, competence, efficiency and untiring effort in support of the mission that must be accomplished by the 22nd Field Maintenance Squadron, Propulsion Branch.

She is enthusiastic and tireless in the performance of her assigned duties. She is resourceful and methodical, applying proven and, often, original job techniques which have produced unquestionably superior results. As a highly motivated individual, she continually strives to increase her knowledge by reading technical orders and applying correct maintenance procedures recommended by this technical data.

Airman Ponzetti is one of the most agressive, intelligent and dedicated individuals that I have ever known. She is completely mission oriented and dedicated to getting the job done in a superior manner. Her positive attitude and initiative have been strong motivating factors in influencing the attitudes and sense of responsibility of her male contemporaries. Her intelligence and professional drive enable her to create warm rapport with superiors and fellow workers alike. Her past performance and great future potential warrant special merit. Because of this, I unreservedly recommend Airman Ponzetti for nomination to the United States Service Academy of her choice.

Joseph M. Rey,
MSgt, USAF, NCOIC, Propulsion Branch.

Recommendation for United States Air Force Academy.
USAFA/RRS.
USAF Academy, CO 80840.

1. Airman Ponzetti enlisted in the Air Force on 23 February 1973, for a period of 4 years. Her intentions from the day she enlisted were to make the Air Force her career. Although she is only 19 years old she displays maturity far beyond her years. It is obvious that Airman Ponzetti exerted much thought prior to her decision to enlist in the Air Force and that she is satisfied she made the right decision.

2. In high school Airman Ponzetti was a good, hard working student and maintained a straight "A" average her senior year. After her enlistment in the Air Force and completion of basic training, she attended the Jet Engine Mechanic School at Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, where she became the third WAF in the Air Force to complete the Jet Engine Mechanic Course. She was an honor graduate from this school, graduating first in her class with a 98 average. Airman Ponzetti was assigned to March Air Force Base on 6 July 1973 and was immediately enrolled in the Career Development Course for upgrade training to the five skill level. She has completed her CDC and is presently awaiting the end of course test. Even then, she will have to wait for the six months minimum time to expire before she can be awarded her five level AFSC. Additionally, Airman Ponzetti, is currently enrolled in off duty college courses which will lead to an aeronautical engineering degree.

3. Airman Ponzetti is an extremely dedicated individual, exceptionally anxious to learn and eager to assist other personnel. Her positive attitude and initiative have been strong motivating factors in influencing the attitudes and sense of responsibility of her male contemporaries. Airman Ponzetti's intelligence and

professional drive enable her to create good rapport with her superiors and fellow workers alike. She has proven herself both professionally and intellectually by being chosen as the outstanding airman of the month for the 22nd Field Maintenance Squadron.

4. It is agreed without exception that Airman Ponzetti is an exceptionally well qualified technician and a professional airman. She is definitely a "front runner" type individual, highly motivated and dedicated, who has gained outstanding recognition for the highest level of professionalism in her duty performance. Her future potential in the Air Force is unlimited and her moral judgment is unquestionable. There is no question that she will attain the goals she has established and, as her career progresses, the Air Force will reap the benefits of this outstanding airman's enthusiasm and vigor. Airman Ponzetti is a most worthy candidate for the United States Air Force Academy.

David M. Williams,
Lt. Col., USAF, Commander.

Department of the Air Force,
Headquarters 22D Combat Support Group (SAC),
March Air Force Base, Calif., May 21, 1974.

Hon. John H. Dent, M.C.,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C. 20515.

Dear Congressman Dent: I am writing on behalf of AIC Teri Ann Ponzetti, a constituent from your state and a member of my squadron.

I have known Ann Ponzetti since she arrived at March AFB in July 1973. She impressed me initially, as a very conscientious hard working young lady. Being the first female jet mechanic on station, she was very much aware of the fact that she would have an extremely rough job ahead of her. Yet she has never waivered in her attempts to improve her education and continue her on the job training to reach the higher skill levels.

She upgraded to the next highest skill level in the minimum time allowed, six months, but finished in three months. To completely upgrade, she finished five volumes of Career Development Courses on the Theory of Jet Engines which included specifics in basic jet engine structure, operation, technical data in propulsion and care and use of hand tools.

Her performance on the job has been exceptional and a tremendous motivating factor within the Field Maintenance Squadron.

As a member of the distaff side of the active military, AIC Ponzetti actively participates in WAF Squadron functions. Because of her personality and ability to get along with her contemporaries, I appointed her Energy Monitor for the WAF Dormitory Complex. Her duties involved daily checks and a consolidated weekly report. She has been my personal representative at meetings in which the energy crisis has been the primary topic. She performed her duties in an outstanding manner and submitted all reports on a timely basis.

This WAF Squadron is the second largest within Strategic Air Command, second only to Headquarters SAC. As a commander who holds a baccalaureate degree in secondary education, I have had the opportunity to meet and know many young women. In my professional judgement as a commander and Regular Commissioned Officer, AIC Ponzetti displays the highest example, the "epitome," of what we expect of our young airmen. She is young, but displays all the attributes needed to grow and mature into one of our fine young officers.

The Air Force Academy has the finest aeronautical curriculum in the country. AIC Ponzetti wants to pursue her education there as a cadet and not as a "BARRIER BREAKER." I feel she is sincere in her efforts, and above all since she is meticulous in her personal appearance and her room in the dormitory is in impeccable order at all times, I feel she could withstand the rigors of the academic life without any problems.

I sincerely recommend she be nominated to attend the Air Force Academy. If you have any further questions or specifics about AIC Ponzetti, please feel free to contact me any time, my address is 22CSG/CCW, March AFB, California 92508.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Phelps,
Captain, USAF, WAF Squadron Commander.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
HEADQUARTERS 22D BOMBARDMENT WING (SAC),
March Air Force Base, Calif., May 20, 1974.

To whom it may concern:

It is with great pleasure that I add my indorsement to all of those who have supported Airman First Class Terri Ann Ponzetti in her endeavor to attend the Air Force Academy. This young lady has been a credit not only to this organization but also to the relatively new program of utilizing women in flight line activities. She has demonstrated that she can maintain her level of proficiency along with her male counterparts and has completed all skill level requirements in the minimum time allotted.

Airman Ponzetti is conscientious, dedicated, hard working, has a pleasing personality and I personally feel that she has the potential to develop into a fine officer. She is meticulous in military bearing and manner, has a sincere desire to further her education in aeronautics and has the ability to withstand pressure. These factors make me feel that she can cope with the rigors of Air Force Academy life.

I fully support this young airman in her endeavor and feel that she will be a credit to the United States Air Force.

GUY D. PERHAM,
Colonel, USAF, Commander.

JEANNETTE HIGH SCHOOL,
Jeannette, Pa., May 8, 1974.

Congressman JOHN H. DENT,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE DENT: *Terri Ponzetti*, a Jeannette High School graduate of 1972 is applying to the Air Force Academy. While in high school, Terri was a very serious and conscientious student. I feel she would be a great asset to the academy and to our country.

Sincerely,

JAMES SACRIPONTE, *Guidance Counselor.*

STATEMENT OF MARY ELLEN GALE, COUNSEL, AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

The American Civil Liberties Union, a national organization of 275,000 members, is dedicated to the protection of individual liberties and rights guaranteed by the Constitution. The ACLU has worked consistently to ensure that all our citizens share equally in the benefits and opportunities, as well as the responsibilities, of self-government.

We believe that women, like men, are required to bear the burden of providing for our national defense and are entitled to share equally in the educational and career opportunities provided by our armed forces. It is because of this that we strongly endorse the proposed legislation (H.R. 9832, H.R. 11267, H.R. 11268, H.R. 10705, H.R. 11711, H.R. 13729, and H.R. 15338) which would provide for the admission of women to the service academies of the United States.

We further urge the enactment of H.R. 15558, which would amend provisions of the United States Code that prohibit women from engaging in combat.

The testimony already given before this Subcommittee, as well as the history of the service academies, demonstrates that the purpose of the academies is to prepare the most qualified people for positions of leadership within the military. This function is severely crippled when one-half the population is turned away, not because of lack of qualification but because of sex.

The armed forces have been more active in recruiting women since the inception of the volunteer army. In testimony before this Subcommittee, the Secretaries of the Army and Navy stressed that women are vital members of their services and that they have shown equal ability compared with men in performing the required tasks.

It is also vital that women seeking to earn their living in the military receive the same opportunities for training and education that men have. The service academies and combat experience provide two of the most important avenues of advancement. There exist no defensible or rational reasons for the government to deny women access to these central responsibilities of military life.

Opponents of equal military rights and responsibilities for women have suggested before this Subcommittee that women are physically unfit to be combat leaders and therefore should not be admitted to the Service Academies on an equal footing with men. Such arguments ignore the outstanding records of accomplishments of thousands of women in civilian activities which require physical stamina and mental skill. A study by the Johnson-O'Connor Research Foundation, Inc. entitled *The Potential of Women* (Bulletin #87, 1971) establishes that women actually excel the performance level of men in a number of mental and physical aptitude tests.

Further, sexual stereotypes which bear no relation to a woman's ability to perform a specific task have been consistently held to violate women's employment rights under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Pay Act of 1963. See for example *Rosenfeld* v. *Southern Pac. Co.* 444 F.2d 1219 (9th Cir. 1971); *Weeks* v. *Southern Bell Tel. & Tel. Co.* 408 F.2d 228 (5th C.A. 1969); *Le Blanc* v. *Southern Tel. & Tel. Co.* 333 F. Supp. 602 (D.C. La. 1971), affirmed 460 F.2d 1228 (5th C.A. 1971). In *Reed* v. *Reed* 404 U.S. 71 (1971) the United States Supreme Court held that a state statutory scheme that conferred mandatory preference on male applicants over female applicants seeking appointment as administrator of an estate violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court concluded that the statutory scheme failed to consider the individual qualifications of the female and male applicants and so provided dissimilar treatment for men and women similarly situated. The present statutory provisions that bar women from the Service Academies and participation in combat-classified jobs are similarly unconstitutional, and deny to women the Equal Protection of the law afforded them by the Fifth Amendment.

The Executive branch of government has also recognized its responsibility to provide equal opportunities for women. Executive Order 11246 set forth in 42 U.S.C. 2000e imposes equal employment opportunity requirements upon federal contractors. The requirements are twofold. The first is a policy of nondiscrimination that covers all employees or potential employees of the contracting party. The second calls for affirmative action to ensure that employees are treated without regard to race, sex, color, religion or national origin. The Armed Forces should do no less.

THE CASE FOR ADMISSION OF WOMEN TO THE SERVICE ACADEMIES

In response to earlier testimony by Rep. Patricia Schroeder of Colorado and Rep. Samuel Stratton of New York that combat training was a secondary aspect of all education at the academies, Secretary of the Army Howard H. Callaway and Lt. General William A. Knowlton, Superintendent United States Military Academy, West Point, singled out combat training as one of the most important of the Army Academy's functions. They characterized such training as too rigorous for most women to endure and warned that standards would be lowered for all if women were permitted to participate. But clearly no such lowering of standards is required. What is required is that women have the same opportunity as men to work toward obtaining the skills and endurance necessary to produce qualified military leaders. Women are already an important part of our national defense. At present 74,000 women serve in our Armed Forces and the Department of Defense estimates that number will increase to 100,000 by June, 1975. The commanding officers at Fort Meade, Maryland, for both the Navy and the Air Force are women, and a woman is the commanding officer of Support Activity, Wuertzberg, Germany.

Further, in an age when military defense depends on technologically advanced weapon systems and persons with the necessary training and judgment to use them effectively, a combination of physical stamina and mental alertness is more important than brute strength.

Combat training is of diminishing importance in the service academies because fewer and fewer military positions require it. Nine out of ten military jobs are noncombat, and the Army has opened 434 of its 482 specialties to women. The Air Force has a pre-medical program. Annapolis prepares its graduates for technology-intensive not combat-intensive jobs. Nearly a third of its graduates last year went into Navy jobs requiring expertise in nuclear power. Others who failed to pass the eye tests entered the Supply Corps or the Civil Engineers. Of the 834 Air Force Academy graduates who were commissioned by the Air Force in 1973 about one-fourth went into administrative positions, five to ten percent went on to graduate school, another ten percent went into navigation training and about half went into pilot training. Even with the current statutory prohibition on women in combat, one-half of the Air Force Academy could be populated by women today without any of the cost-ineffectiveness of training women for jobs they cannot legally hold that the Department of Defense warned against.

The cost-ineffectiveness argument is at odds with another fact. Foreign nationals have been permitted to attend the service academies, reap the benefits of the education, and then use what they have learned in their own countries.

No educational program comparable to the service academies is now available to women. ROTC programs do not offer women the same benefits as attendance at the service academies. The Defense Department's own figures show greater and greater percentages of academy graduates among the highest paid positions in the military. The taxes of women as well as men support these institutions, yet the benefits are withheld from the female sex. Additionally, because of the combat restrictions on women, ROTC scholarships are awarded to women for two years only. The women, unlike the men, must pay their own way for two years while pursuing their military careers.

The benefits of education at the service academies, the fact that few military jobs require physical strength as opposed to endurance and skills women have the capacity to attain and the need for qualified leaders of both sexes in all areas of military as well as civilian life, compel the conclusion that the service academies should accept women on an equal basis with men.

WOMEN AND COMBAT

The continued exclusion of women from combat under 10 U.S.C. §§ 6015 (Navy) and 8549 (Air Force), and under an Army regulation, contributes to the military reluctance to provide them with leadership training at the service academies. Admiral William P. Mack, Superintendent U.S. Naval Academy, and Secretary of the Navy S. William Middendorf II testified before this Subcommittee that the Naval Academy found it impractical to admit women because they could not be assigned to positions where their training would be put to use.

A similar rationale was applied by the only court so far to rule on the constitutionality of denying women admission to the service academies. In *Edwards* v. *Schlesinger* 43USLW 2009 (D.D.C. July 9, 1974) the United States District Court for the District of Columbia held that the exclusion of women from the Naval and Air Force academies did not violate Fifth Amendment guarantees. The District Court stated that because it was the purpose of the academies to train officers for combat, and the admission of women would mean a decrease in the number of male graduates, the policy of admitting only male applicants was permissible under the constitution.

Repeal of the statutory restrictions on women in combat would thus reinforce their right to attend the service academies by ensuring that they will undertake the full array of military responsibilities for which they will be trained.

Although there is no statute forbidding women to engage in army combat, an Army regulation does bar them from combat duty. Yet there is no persuasive support for the argument that women are not fit for combat. As far back as the founding of our nation, pioneer women demonstrated their bravery, willingness, and capacity to defend their homeland. Women medical personnel have always been present in the dangerous areas of battle, performing complicated and vital tasks upon which many lives depend. Large numbers of municipal police departments have employed women on foot, and in car patrol, in homicide divisions, in vice squads and in every other aspect of police work. Further, foreign nations have made more judicious use of female military personnel. Russia, for example, had women fighter pilots during World War II.

Classification of certain positions as combat jobs has also been confusing and overbroad. The Navy designates all ships with one or more guns as combat vessels. This classification takes in cargo and repair ships which seldom, if ever, engage in combat. Yet the net effect of such arbitrary categorization is to exclude women from significant areas of the military where their qualifications and services are needed. Further, because of the combat-non-combat distinction, the Army has closed its training programs in infantry, armor, and artillery to women. Moreover, it is a well-known fact that distinguished combat service offers one of the surest avenues of advancement in the military. Yet this is denied to women.

The exclusion of women from combat interferes with the military rotation system which requires that a number of non-combat jobs be held open for officers returning from combat duty. Since women officers are currently eligible only for non-combat, their numbers limit the positions available for men. The answer to this personnel problem again lies in removing combat restrictions on women. Logic and fairness argue for the removal of the combat prohibitions against women. The Merchant Marine Academy is already admitting women. Admiral William Mack unhesitatingly stated that if the combat laws were changed women could perform any job in the Navy. Beyond all this, it has been the continuing strength of this country that a chosen livelihood may be pursued without unfair governmental intrustion. The power to lift these senseless restrictions on women so they may fully answer the needs of their country's defense, as they wish to do, rests with the Congress. We urge this Subcommittee to act favorably on the proposed legislation.

House of Representatives,
Committee on Armed Services,
Subcommittee No. 2,
Washington, D.C., Thursday, August 8, 1974.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building Hon. O. C. Fisher (chairman of the subcommittee), presiding.

Mr. Fisher. Today we continue our hearings on bills to eliminate discrimination based on sex with respect to the appointment and addition of persons to the service academies.

We welcome this morning a representative from the Maritime Administration, Mr. A. Reading Van Doren, Jr., the General Counsel, and the Director of Admissions at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, Commander Emmanuel L. Jenkins. The gentlemen will offer us the benefit of their experiences with the admission of women to the Merchant Marine Academy.

Also, this morning we will consider two bills, H.R. 14401, which would authorize military bands to make recordings and tapes in connection with the Bicentennial celebration and H.R. 15148, which would extend the time limit for the award of certain military decorations. For those measures we have as our witnesses, Rear Admiral William Thompson, Chief of Information, Department of the Navy and Major General Kenneth L. Tallman, Director, Personnel Plans, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Department of the Air Force.

First, we will receive the statements of Mr. Van Doren and Commander Jenkins.

You may proceed, gentlemen.

STATEMENT OF A. READING VAN DOREN, JR., GENERAL COUNSEL MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Van Doren. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am A. Reading Van Doren, Jr., General Counsel for the Maritime Administration.

I am pleased to appear before your committee to testify with respect to the legal background concerning the admission of women to the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Points, N.Y. I am accompanied by Commander Jenkins who is Director of Admissions at the Merchant Marine Academy. Commander Jenkins will testify as to the admissions procedure at the Academy and the integration of the women into the school's program and facilities.

The Secretary of Commerce is authorized by section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to maintain a Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., for the instruction and preparation of officers for service in the U.S. Merchant Marine. Nominations to the Academy are allocated among the 50 States and Puerto Rico in proportion to their representation in Congress, and to Guam, American Samoa, the

Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone and the District of Columbia by special provision. The Secretary of Commerce appoints qualified candidates from those nominated in order of merit as established by examinations.

As you may know, on January 24, 1974, the Maritime Administration amended its regulations governing the admission of cadets to the Academy to provide for the nomination of women, except by the Governor of the Canal Zone. The Maritime Administration was able to provide for the nomination of women without seeking an amendment to section 216(b) of the act because the language of section 216(b) does not, except in the case of the Canal Zone, differentiate between potential nominees on the basis of sex. Section 216(b) generally provides for the nomination of "qualified candidates" and otherwise refers to such candidates as "persons," "selected persons," "citizens," and "officers."

With regard to the two vacancies allocated each year to the Canal Zone, however, section 216(b) provides that such vacancies shall be filled by nominations by the Governor of the Canal Zone "from among the sons of residents of the Canal Zone and the sons of personnel of the U.S. Government and the Panama Canal Company residing in the Republic of Panama." This reference to "sons of residents" and "sons of personnel" precluded the Maritime Administration from providing for the nomination of women by the Governor of the Canal Zone.

Our conclusion in this regard was supported in the recent decision by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in *Don Edwards, et al.* v. *James R. Schlesinger, et al. and Jerome Waldie, et al.* v. *James R. Schlesinger, et al.* Section 1 of title I of the United States Code provides that in any Act of Congress the use of the masculine gender shall include the feminine except where the context indicates otherwise. The Court in interpreting section 1 of title I concluded that the use of the word "sons" is not to be interpreted as including the feminine gender, while use of the words "he" and "his" are to be so interpreted.

The Department of Commerce has transmitted to Congress a draft bill to provide for the nomination of men and women by the Governor of the Canal Zone. This draft bill has been introduced in the House as H.R. 15448 and in the Senate as S. 3692. No action on these bills has yet been taken.

This concludes the formal presentation of my testimony. I will be pleased to answer any questions from members of the committee.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you, Mr. Van Doren.

I believe the more orderly procedure will be for Commander Jenkins to proceed now with his statement, and then if there are questions, you can each make your contribution at the proper time.

Go right ahead, Commander.

STATEMENT OF COMDR. EMMANUEL L. JENKINS, DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS, U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Commander JENKINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to testify before your committee regarding our experience to date with the admission of women at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point.

In 1972, the Merchant Marine Academy formed an ad hoc committee to make a study and devise a plan detailing the problems and possible solutions relative to the admission of females.

This study and plan were completed and submitted to the Superintendent, Rear Adm. A. B. Engel, in December 1972.

Some of the salient points and assumptions of the plan were: (1) females would be admitted at some future date; (2) female applicants would be required to meet the U.S. Naval Reserve commissioning standards for women; (3) male and female midshipmen would complete a common program with modifications only to accommodate the basic physiological and strength differences between men and women; (4) female midshipmen would be housed in existing barracks insuring as much privacy as possible; (5) the physical examinations required by the Academy would be modified slightly for females; and (6) the Academy would hope to attract a sizable group of applicants and admit a sufficient number to permit optimal use of staff personnel and facilities, and to compensate for anticipated student attrition during the 4-year period.

The study outlined three phases, as follows:

Preparation.—This phase provided for the establishment of policies related to the admission of females and identified changes that had to be made in existing training programs and facilities at the Academy in order to accommodate females.

Transition.—This phase provided for implementing the modification of facilities, requisition of supplies peculiar to females. and revision of publications, physical and revision of publications, physical and admissions requirements, regulations, manuals and directives.

Execution.—This phase was planned to commence after arrival of females and included the operation of programs developed in the first two phases as well as the employment of such modifications as might become necessary to insure the effectiveness of the plan.

It should be noted that another agency of the Commerce Department, the National Oceanic and Atomspheric Administration, had begun accepting women applicants in mid-1972. Since NOAA's officer training program is conducted at the Academy, some experience in accommodating women had already been gained.

The Maritime Administration changed its regulations, effective January 24, 1974, to admit women to the Academy.

Following this, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs, Mr. Robert Blackwell, informed all nominating authorities of the change and invited them to have their nominating assistants attend a briefing February 8 to be conducted by the Academy.

No extension of the deadline date for the receipt of nominations was included in the same correspondence.

Admissions requirements were not changed or modified in any manner. Females were considered on the same basis as males.

Physical requirements and medical examinations were modified in three areas:

(1) females weight and height tables were used;
(2) the PAP test was given; and
(3) pelvic examinations were required.

The admissions results were as follows:

Total females nominated	34
Total completing applications	33
Number academically qualified	24
Number physically qualified	17
Number academically and physically qualified	17
Number offered appointments	20

This may appear to be incongruous.

Our candidates are offered appointments once they are academically qualified, subject to later physical clearance. Three candidates were offered appointments based on their academic qualifications but who did not later receive physical clearance.

Number accepting	15
Number remaining on alternate list	1
Number reporting July 16	15

All female appointees along with other principal appointees were invited to the Academy May 15 for a briefing and orientation.

Eight of the 15 female appointees visited the Academy before reporting. Three others had personal contact or interviews with staff officers and students.

Only three appointees—domiciled in Arizona, South Carolina, and Delaware—had not visited the Academy or met personally with a representative from the Academy prior to reporting July 16.

The indoctrination program, conducted July 16–29, requires participation by all incoming students. It is designed to prepare the new "plebes" physically and instill in them the mental attitude and discipline required for undertaking the demanding academic and physical training to become merchant officers and leaders in the maritime industry.

The typical weekday and weekend schedules are included as attachment I. During indoctrination, female midshipmen participated in all aspects of training with only minor adjustments. Their participation in certain physical sports was on a voluntary basis. Following is the Commandant's assessment of the 2-week period participation by females in the indoctrination program:

> Reporting day found the female candidates excited and under a great deal of pressure due to the demands of both the news media and indoctrination program. As the orientation program progressed, we encountered various situations as noted below:
>
> (1) Unhappiness because of regulation haircuts (shoulder length);
>
> (2) Some females could not keep up with male midshipmen during jogging and morning calisthenics;
>
> (3) Some females experienced difficulty in accepting reprimands and orders from midshipmen officers; and
>
> (4) Midshipmen officers found it difficult to handle females as they would males under military programing.
>
> As the indoctrination program progressed, it was noted that the females had less problems with the physical aspects of their training. It was noted that they were becoming more concerned with Academy activities, uniforms, makeup, and academic programing.
>
> At this point, they were more open with their conversations and questions. They appeared to be somewhat tired, but happy.
>
> Questions arose concerning uniform dress; some females preferred male uniforms to female uniforms. Some females experienced difficulty in handling the M–1 rifle during military drill, otherwise all aspects of drill were accepted without difficulty.
>
> The physical changes made to the barracks to accommodate female midshipmen were minimal. The following is a list of alterations and equipment provided the female living quarters:

(1) A portable divider was constructed for privacy on one wing of the 4th Company barracks;

(2) Urinals were removed from the head—that is a euphemism for "bathroom," and a vanity, mirror, and extra lighting was installed;

(3) Each female room was fitted with a full length mirror and a bar for drying clothing; and

(4) Female quarters were also equipped with a passageway telephone, water cooler, electric clock, and hall window shades.

During the 2-week orientation or indoctrination period an average of 24 plebes have dropped out since 1960, the minimum number being 4 in 19[illegible] and a high of 44 in 1973.

This year, 17 plebes dropped out, of whom 1 was a female. She resigned after completing the indoctrination and gave as her reason for resigning, "the academic course of study does not satisfy my wants."

No major problems have surfaced thus far in the integration of females into the corps of midshipmen. Their assignment to merchant vessels for training next year will be done on the basis of their major selection, that is, deck, engineering, or the dual program. They will participate in 10 of the 20 intramural athletic activities and 7 of the 16 intercollegiate athletic activities that the Academy participates in. Facility modification and other conversions have taken place or are proceeding and adjustment, where necessary, will be made to make this transition as smooth and effective as possible.

This concludes the formal presentation of my testimony. I will be pleased to answer any questions from members of the committee.

Mr. **Fisher**. Thank you, Commander.

I think you have given us, both of you, have given us a very good picture of how the Merchant Marine Academy functions in terms of this new experience you are having.

What is the total number of your student body?

Commander **Jenkins**. Our student body is currently around 1,000-plus, 1,020, 1,040—something like that.

Mr. **Fisher**. Is that your capacity?

Commander **Jenkins**. Our capacity is in that area. However, one-half of the second-year class are always at sea, traveling aboard merchant vessels; so at any given time, we normally have around 750 or 800 students at the Academy.

Mr. **Fisher**. Your curriculum, as I understand it, is a regular 4-year course?

Commander **Jenkins**. Yes.

Mr. **Fisher**. Somewhat comparable to the average college curriculum.

Commander **Jenkins**. It is different in that we have a 11-month academic year.

Our students start in August; except the plebes who start the third week of July, and classes end in June. Plebes spend 11 months at the Academy their first year.

As I mentioned, one-half of the second-year class goes aboard merchant vessels. These are subsidized merchant vessels. They learn the duties and responsibilities of deck and engineering officers, in a dual program specialty aboard these merchant vessels and they return to the Academy to complete the remainder of their second year.

The third year, the students spend one-half of their year traveling aboard merchant vessels. So we differ slightly in that one academic year, or 11 months, is spent at sea.

Mr. **Fisher**. They are given reserve commissions, are they, when they graduate?

Commander **Jenkins**. Yes.

We have three requirements for graduation: The student must satisfy our academic requirements. They also must pass the Coast Guard licensing examination to become a merchant officer, and they must accept, if offered by the Navy, a commission in the Navy to be an ensign in the Naval Reserve; or they can apply to the Coast Guard and go on active duty in the Coast Guard for 3 years, or they can go into another branch of of the Commerce Department, called the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and serve their 3 years as an officer in that particular branch of service.

Mr. **Fisher**. What is the length of the commitment after they are commissioned?

Commander **Jenkins**. After commissioning, they have 3 years that they can spend on active duty in the Navy or one of the other two branches of service, or they can apply to the Air Force, the Army or the Marine Corps. That is contingent on this requirement at that particular time.

Three years on active duty fulfills the service obligation. They remain in the Reserves for an additional 3 years.

Mr. **Fisher**. That is a mandatory requirement; is it?

Commander **Jenkins**. This is an obligation. However, it is not legally binding. They can fulfill their service obligation in three other ways. They can sail under their licenses aboard an American flagship for 6 months for 3 consecutive years, or 4 months for 4 consecutive years. That also fulfills the service obligation.

The fourth way to satisfy the service obligation other than going on active duty is to go into a maritime related field, or undertake full-time maritime related graduate study while maintaining active Naval Reserve status.

Mr. **Fisher**. Can you give us an estimate of the total cost required to put one student through the 4-year course you have described? You can give us an approximate total. We have had those estimates from the other Academies.

Commander **Jenkins**. We have not completed the one for last year, but the one for the previous year the figure was $32,800.

Mr. **Fisher**. $32,000?

Commander **Jenkins**. $32,800.

Mr. **Fisher**. Very well.

Does your curriculum include or contemplate training for combat duty?

Commander **Jenkins**. We have a Naval Science Department at the Academy, so as such, our students do receive an indoctrination into naval orientation organization administration and operations.

Mr. **Fisher**. I am a little hazy there, about what that would involve.

I would assume that maritime service in general is not a combat service, such as you have on combat ships in the Navy.

Is it classified as combat duty when you go on these ships?

Commander **Jenkins**. No. We are under the Department of Commerce, which is a civilian agency.

Mr. FISHER. But it is not generally classified as combat duty, when you are assigned to these merchant ships you referred to; is that correct?

Commander JENKINS. No, it is not considered combat duty.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Daniel?

Mr. DANIEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

While I recognize the reason for having these witnesses here this morning, I think it has been unfair to them because of their very limited experience with the matter that we are considering.

I think the testimony is really irrelevant because the Merchant Marine Academy does not participate in combat, and to base our conclusions on the experience of the Merchant Marine Academy, would seem to me would be extremely dangerous.

I have no questions.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you. Mr. Dickinson?

Mr. DICKINSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a very few questions.

As a result of the admission of women into the Academy, did you have to make any change in your rules or curriculum?

Commander JENKINS. There were no changes in our curriculum. There have been changes in the rules. They have been modified only to accommodate the basic physiological differences and strength differences between males and females, mostly in the rules having to do with physical activities. Some women have participated in touch football and some other athletic activities during indoctrination on a voluntary basis.

And I think one male plebe is still trying to get over how he was really knocked off his feet by this young woman who was going after the person with the ball.

Mr. DICKINSON. Is it mandatory for the males to play football?

Commander JENKINS. Football is not mandatory. They have to participate in some intramural or intrasectional athletic activity during indoctrination.

Mr. DICKINSON. What I am leading up to is, are the men and women treated exactly the same?

Commander JENKINS. Yes. They were treated exactly the same, and I had an occasion on Monday to interview the females and it was interesting.

The Commandant also felt the indoctrination went much smoother this year and perhaps this was one of the reasons for our lower attrition was the fact we did have females this year.

The one female I mentioned who dropped out said she felt the curriculum was not in keeping with her particular wants. She did, however, participate in all of the activities. We felt than many of the males that would possibly have left did not because they wanted to show they could take it if the females could.

Mr. DICKINSON. This has a little reverse English on it then.

You are saying the fact that you did have females in the Academy kept the dropout rate of the males from going up; is that right?

Commander JENKINS. There was that feeling because we had the least number of dropouts in years. Of course, we really cannot compare it with some of the Vietam war years, 1960 and 1964, because they had to go on active duty if they dropped out. So we sort of feel that this was one of the considerations.

Mr. **Dickinson**. This was your first year for women in the Academy?

Commander **Jenkins**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Dickinson**. So you really have no dropout rate experience for them before now in order to come to any valid conclusion; is that right?

Commander **Jenkins**. We have just experienced with the males.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Of those admitted, you lost one for the reason that you stated?

Commander **Jenkins**. That is right.

Mr. **Dickinson**. You say those are the only rule changes that you have made for the Academy?

Commander **Jenkins**. Yes, to my knowledge, those were the only rules that were changed during the indoctrination.

Mr. **Dickinson**. What happens if a female plebe cadet gets pregnant?

Commander **Jenkins**. She would probably be found unfit for duty and she would be suspended under the rules and regulations.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Would this be a disciplinary matter or just a finding of fact as for any other illness?

Commander **Jenkins**. This would be a finding of fact, I believe.

Mr. **Dickinson**. You haven't promulgated any rules or done anything in anticipation that you might have to cope with this?

Commander **Jenkins**. Well, we are conducting the regular sex education programs with the females as we are with the males.

Mr. **Dickinson**. It hardly bears on the problem that I am talking about.

Commander **Jenkins**. Well, if they are found to be pregnant, they would be suspended.

This is the policy that has been cited by decision, that they would be suspended if they were found to be pregnant.

Mr. **Dickinson**. It would not be a matter of disciplinary action; it wouldn't be a matter of punishment?

Commander **Jenkins**. No, not as a matter of punishment.

Mr. **Dickinson**. If they are punished, what happens?

Commander **Jenkins**. When they are found fit for duty, they could come back. Wherever there is a female pregnant, there is a male somewhere.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Yes, on or off base, but you are saying, then, that after the child were born, she would be permitted to come back and resume her studies?

Commander **Jenkins**. This is what I was told, because I asked that particular question: If a female were to become pregnant, the policy would be that she would be found unfit for duty, and suspended, and afterwards, she could come back.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Would it be necessary that she furnish proof that she had no dependents in order to come back into the Academy?

Commander **Jenkins**. Well, you see, under our rules and regulations at the Academy, marriage is permitted amongst our students or midshipmen at the Academy, but it is clearly pointed out that the Academy bears no responsibility for this and we discourage it.

This was a matter of legal decision, one student was married, and the courts found that he should be reinstated and graduated from the Academy.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Well, if I understand you correctly, it would make no difference whether the female midshipman were married or not if she became pregnant, she would be suspended until her physical disability, at least, was no longer extant and if she applied, she could come back in and continue her training so long as she was not, encumbered by a dependent.

Would that be a true statement or do you know?

Commander **Jenkins**. She could not bring the dependent to the Academy to live on the grounds of the Academy. The Academy takes no responsibility for the dependent.

If she were found to be fit for duty again, she was qualified as a midshipman and had not really committed acts that were considered to be detrimental to the Academy, and she could perform her duties, it is my understanding she could come back.

Mr. **Daniel**. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **Dickinson**. Yes.

Mr. **Daniel**. Why couldn't she be treated the same way as a male cadet who becomes ill and may be hospitalized? Why should she be suspended when a male cadet would be given perhaps a leave of absence, or something of that sort?

Commander **Jenkins**. I suppose it is a matter of semantics. We have medical setbacks. This would probably be considered in the same way.

Mr. **Daniel**. Thank you.

Mr. **Dickinson**. You say that among the complaints that the young ladies made was the cutting of hair, regulation length, which means cutoff at the collar, I suppose, or above shoulder.

Do you find that any different from the men?

Commander **Jenkins**. In terms of the complaints?

Mr. **Dickinson**. Regulation haircuts.

Commander **Jenkins**. No, they get used to it. The males are also quite upset about losing their long hair when they come in and this is part of the training. It is a part of bringing everybody down to the same level.

To come there and be put in with other well qualified students is somewhat depressing. They have been getting all kinds of press and publicity back in the hometown. When they come to the Academy everybody is considered the same.

It is kind of psychologically damaging to them; their egos, and to lose their hair, they feel that they are sort of expatriated or away from society.

Mr. **Dickinson**. Did you make any rules regarding makeup?

Commander Jenkins. Makeup is accepted, so long as it is not defacing or unattractive. I think there are considerations that have to be taken into account, females do wear makeup.

Mr. **Dickinson**. That was going to be my next question.

Was there any difference in the male or female there?

Commander **Jenkins**. There is no distinction. They can wear their makeup and so long as it is not abusive, I should say.

Mr. **Dickinson**. But you really have no ennunicated or pronounced rule regarding makeup as yet?

Commander **Jenkins**. As long as it does not detract from the uniform, or their physical appearance, then they can wear makeup.

Mr. DICKINSON. That is a rule or regulation that you have, or is it just an announced policy? Evidently, you didn't have that as a rule 2 years ago.

Commander JENKINS. I can not state categorically, but I believe that it will probably be in the regulations.

Mr. DICKINSON. Is it in the second or third year that women go aboard ship, or that the midshipmen go aboard ship? You haven't any experience yet to draw on as far as women going aboard ship; is that right?

Commander JENKINS. Only from the standpoint of women who have served aboard merchant vessels, as cooks, maids, waitresses, et cetera, and the experience drawn from other foreign countries where there are women merchant officers, ship's masters, et cetera.

We do not anticipate any problems that we will not be able to handle. We only assign two students to a ship, and usually, it is a deck student and an engineering student, and they have individual quarters for the most part on the ships.

The females, like the males, can pass, if they are in engineering.

Mr. DICKINSON. No further questions.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, before I ask questions, I wonder if I could have unanimous consent to place two matters into the record nere:

One of them, Mr. Chairman, is a report on women aboard ship, done by the Naval Electronics Laboratory Center at San Diego. [Retained in committee files.]

Mr. FISHER. Without objection, it will be included in the record.

Mr. WILSON. It might be the staff would want to get the complete report. I just have portions of it here, but I think it is interesting to observe some of the findings here from this report.

It says, women do the job. They are professionals. The women are utilized in all departments except the engineroom—I don't know why the engineroom—but the level of performance of the women is high. They pass exams with the highest possible marks.

Most chiefs and officers indicated women working with them are equal or superior to men in terms of job performance, et cetera.

I think this report could be valuable to the committee and do appreciate having it put in.

There also is a report, March 1973, the Naval Ship Systems Command on female personnel aboard ship having ability.

Again, we may want to get the full report for the committee.

The next thing I have is a factsheet that I asked Mr. Hogan to obtain for me having to do with hostile fire duty pay for women in the service.

It seems that starting with the Vietnam conflict, we have been paying combat duty pay for women. There were some 5,000 women in Vietnam who received combat duty pay because of the location of where they were assigned, and because of the fact that practically all of Vietnam was considered a combat duty area.

I think this might be valuable to be placed in the record also. It shows the women have been getting combat pay.

Mr. FISHER. Without objection, the report will be included in the record.

[The report referred to follows:]

FACT SHEET—BACKGROUND DATA ON SERVICE WOMEN AND HOSTILE FIRE DUTY PAY

The history of Hostile Fire Duty Pay for women began during the Vietnam conflict. Existing records indicate that no women received hostile fire duty pay, combat duty pay, or badge pay before the Vietnam conflict.

In World War II, the only authorized combat pays were badge pays. These were paid to holders of the Combat Infantryman's Badge or the Expert Medical Corpsman Badge, and were paid only to persons holding these badges and actually engaged in armed conflict or, in the Medical Corps case, persons exposed to hostile fire and the same hazards as the combat infantry.

In the Korean War, Combat Duty Pay was authorized for persons assigned to duty in designated combat units serving in specified combat areas.

The nature of the war in Vietnam made it difficult to distinguish clearly combat areas from noncombat areas. Consequently, Hostile Fire Duty Pay was authorized and paid by geographic zones. These zones included the entire land area of North and South Vietnam, the waters contiguous thereto, and the air space above. This definition of a geographic zone allowed many persons to receive Hostile Fire Duty Pay who were not actually engaged in armed conflict or even subjected to hostile fire. For example, a flight nurse who flew over the area for the specified number of days in given months was entitled to the pay.

The passage of P.L. 88-132 (October 2, 1963) authorized Hostile Fire Duty Pay for the Vietnam period. The basic policies governing the receipt of Hostile Fire Duty Pay are identical for women and men. As set forth by DoD Directive 1340.6 (November 19, 1963, and August 1964), the policy initially allowed only persons serving with units engaged in armed conflict and operating in specified areas of Vietnam to draw Hostile Fire Duty Pay, but a memorandum, effective on January 1, 1966, was issued which redefined the hostile fire area and effectively authorized payment of Hostile Fire Duty Pay to all uniformed service personnel serving anywhere in Vietnam, all of which (including land area, waters contiguous thereto, and airspace above) was defined as an area where they were subject to hostile fire or in imminent danger of being exposed to hostile fire.

Women are prohibited from combat duty either by law or service regulations or both. Navy and Air Force are precluded by statute (10 U.S.C. 6015 and 8549, respectively) from assigning women to duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions and vessels in the Navy other than hospital ships and transports. Army, in pamphlet 600-3, prohibits the utilization of WAC officers in positions involving close combat or combat support. Enlisted women are denied entrance into combat or combat related skills by AR 611-201, chapter 4, in the Army; MOS Manual P-1200-7 in the Marine Corps; and AF Manual 39-1 in the Air Force.

A table containing statistical estimates for the number of women who received Hostile Fire Duty Pay in Vietnam and also, for further background information, the Report of the 1971 Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation on Hostile Fire Pay are attached.

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF WOMEN WHO RECEIVED HOSTILE FIRE PAY[1]—VIETNAM

	Officers	Officer nurses	Total officers	Enlisted	Total
Army	113	2,981	3,094	600	3,694
Navy	8	511	519	0	519
Marine Corps	8	0	8	28	36
Air Force			650	100	750
Total DOD			4,271	728	4,999

---

[1] Direct statistics on women receiving hostile fire duty pay are not available, since the statistics on recipients are not differentiated by sex. Consequently, the data presented are estimates based on records of women assigned to Vietnam.

KOREA

Existing records indicate that no women received combat duty pay.

WORLD WAR II

No women received combat badge pay or medical badge pay.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. **Wilson**. Commander, first, let me say that I respectfully must disagree with my friend, Mr. Daniel, from Virginia.

I think that your statement is quite relevant, because what it does show is the fact that women have come into an academy that is similar to our military academies, even though you do not have, or do not train women for combat.

You have a university-type situation, a school situation, where they are doing academic work and intramural athletic activities that is very similar to what goes on in the three combat military academies.

You indicated that what the record had been of dropouts after the indoctrination period. Of the 15 women who were admitted, one dropped out. What was the total number of plebes that were in the class?

Commander **Jenkins**. 349.

Mr. **Wilson**. There were 16 male plebes that dropped out after the indoctrination period?

Commander **Jenkins**. Yes.

Mr. **Wilson**. You apparently indicate that the ladies do quite well. They may be a little slower in the jogging, to begin with, but they catch up quickly, and they haven't had any really great difficulty insofar as staying up with the men in the Academy until all of these things that they would be expected to do?

Commander **Jenkins**. That is right.

I suppose it is only because they were singled out and some did notice that a few were lagging behind, but they were not the last. There were some males back there that were tailing behind.

Mr. **Wilson**. What is the planning, Commander, of the Merchant Marine Academy insofar as future classes?

Is it intended to increase the number of women after?

Of course, this would be subject to the number of applications that are submitted, I suppose.

Commander **Jenkins**. Our plans allow for an expansion, if we continue the separate accommodations for females; that is, one wing of the barracks and we will just expand it.

There could be at some future point possibly their full integration into, that is, two women living to a room. We assign students two to a room. It could be we will do it the same way as they do it with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration officer training program, where they will use same facilities, restaurant, restroom facilities; when a female goes in, she locks the door, the same as at home.

Mr. **Wilson**. Actually, even though they are not trained for combat, will they be trained for all types of ship responsibilities? Is there any restriction on any part of the ship that the women would be assigned to from the training she would receive in the Merchant Marine Academy?

Commander **Jenkins**. No, Mr. Wilson. All of our students are assigned. We send two students to a ship, as I mentioned. They get 1-on-1 training, and they make the regular run with the ship.

The shipping company pays them. This is the only time that our students receive actual cash pay during their training, and they would receive 1-on-1 type training from an engineering officer or a deck officer aboard a ship. The deck officers are the ones that are concerned with the safe navigation, cargo, et cetera, on the ship, and an engineering officer is concerned with the propulsion system of what makes a ship go, creating the steam and the machinery, so there would be no distinction.

Mr. **Wilson**. What is the role of the Merchant Marine during wartime, or however they are called upon?

Commander **Jenkins**. During the wartime, they are integrated right into the Navy, for the most part.

We do have a military sealift program, and all of our graduate students are required to serve in the Naval Reserve for 6 years upon graduation.

Mr. **Wilson**. I would imagine members of the Merchant Marine who were serving in World War II would be a little offended if someone accused them of not doing as much in many cases as the Navy was doing itself. For example in troop carrying and transport, et cetera, where they were subject to submarine attack and hostile fire, et cetera.

Would that be true?

Commander **Jenkins**. I do not quite understand your question. Could you restate the question?

Mr. **Wilson**. During World War II, was the Merchant Marine brought into combat conditions similar to what the Navy might have been?

Commander **Jenkins**. Yes. We have lost over 6,000 officers during the past two world wars. In 1790, I believe it was, the commanders of the six Navy frigates were merchant officers, so historically, the Merchant Marine is the mother of the Navy.

Mr. **Wilson**. If these women who are trained stay in the Merchant Marine, would they be expected to do the same type of duty in the event we were involved in a war and the Merchant Marine was brought into the conflict for duty?

Commander **Jenkins**. We have not clarified this issue.

If women cannot be assigned to combat ships, they will be assigned to transport and hospital ships.

Mr. **Wilson**. Is that a regulation in the Merchant Marine?

Commander **Jenkins**. That is, I believe, an act of Congress.

Mr. **Wilson**. The Navy?

Commander **Jenkins**. Department of Defense.

Mr. **Wilson**. In other words, they would come under jurisdiction of the Navy?

Commander **Jenkins**. Right. They cannot be assigned for duty aboard a combat ship. I believe this is one of the issues that you are concerned with here, and so as such, if our female midshipmen, wanted to spend 1 month fulfilling their service obligation aboard a naval ship, they would have to currently be assigned to a hospital ship or transport ship, or be assigned to some other type of duty.

Mr. **Wilson**. If the law were to be repealed, the women would be trained for full duty insofar as the Merchant Marine is concerned and in line with what the men are being trained for?

Commander **Jenkins**. Precisely. They are being trained now, the same way the men are being trained. It is just that we have a stipulation they cannot be assigned to combat ships, but their background training would be exactly the same, and if the regulations were changed, they would be subject to being called to augment the naval fleet the same as male merchant officers.

Mr. **Wilson**. It would be interesting to see how many are still there at the end of the 4 years.

Commander **Jenkins**. This is a 4-year program.

Mr. **Wilson**. And how many apply in the next few years, whether this is just a novelty or whether they apply seriously in large numbers in succeeding years.

Commander **Jenkins**. I would expect the numbers would be higher, because what this is effectively doing is opening up a completely new area to women, one that has been closed before.

And, as you know, women are far behind men in this country in the types of positions that they can have. This year only a handful of the companies soliciting our graduates, three or four companies, were looking for one-third of our graduates, and the starting salaries were between $18,000 and $24,000; so what this does is to open up a whole new area for women. It also means that we are bringing in some additional types of leadership talent that we haven't had. I think the country can use it.

Mr. **Wilson**. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Fisher**. Mrs. Holt.

Mrs. **Holt**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Commander, do you have figures for the male admissions?

Commander **Jenkins**. There were about 519 that were offered appointments that were academically qualified.

Mrs. **Holt**. Academically and physically qualified?

Commander **Jenkins**. Yes.

Mrs. **Holt**. What precipitated the formation of the ad hoc committee to make this study? Was it because you recognized that you were losing a great resource, or was it pressure or a deluge of applications? What brought that about?

Commander **Jenkins**. During 1972, there was introduced in the House and Senate a joint resolution, the Equal Rights Amendment for Women, and following this, our ad hoc committee was set up at that time.

We would like to think that it was due to our perspicacity or foresight, and assumption No. 1, that females some day would be admitted, so we may as well start getting ready.

I happened to have been in Washington at the Maritime Administration, shortly after the time that it was submitted to Congress, and I was told to start gearing my thinking toward the admission of females to the Academy.

The Superintendent, after that time, asked for an ad hoc committee to be formed to explore and prepare a plan for the smooth transition, should we be told to admit females.

And then, in December 1973, Mr. Dent, Secretary of Commerce, said, "Why not?"

And there was no reason why not, except for the Canal Zone, which it specifically states that it is for the sons, and we went ahead with the printing in the Federal Register, January 24th, to admit females to the Academy.

Mr. Blackwell then invited each Congressman to a briefing on February 8th. We had an inch of snow in Washington on that date, but we managed to get the word out, and this was the forerunner of it.

Mrs. Holt. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I apologize for being a little late here this morning, but I had to testify on a matter over in the Veterans Committee.

I certainly will read very carefully your statement and the record that is made here and I congratulate you on the foresight that the Academy has had in taking this step.

I think it is an important step and the right step.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Commander Jenkins. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Daniel has another question.

Mr. Daniel. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Merchant Marine Academy for providing this opportunity for women.

I think it accentuates my real hangup with this bill. I favor the admission of women to the service academies, but I am not sure that I am ready to vote to commit them to combat.

So my quarrel is not with the Merchant Marine Academy. I commend you for what you have done. I think it is the right and proper thing.

Commander Jenkins. May I add something as an addendum to Mr. Daniel's statement?

During this interview of all the females on Monday, and concurrently, I interviewed an equal number of males, and I had them chosen from students that met some members of the committee here. They were nominated by members of the Armed Services Committee, and it was interesting that the females when asked if they would want to serve in combat, if it were a part of their graduation requirements, if they were to be commissioned into the Naval Reserve, and this followed possibly being called for combat duty if they are eligible and not one felt that she would not serve if called to. I thought their answers were rather astute, and rather honorable. Some of them said that, if I could paraphrase it, it is better to have them prepare for it and not need them, than to need them and not have them.

Mr. Daniel. I couldn't agree more. That is gratifying.

Mr. Fisher. Mr. Dickinson, do you have another question?

Mr. Dickinson. I think you pretty well covered it but just to make sure that we didn't leave anything out, you mentioned at least one benefit to the Academy by having women admitted was having some very top paying jobs open to them, opening an entirely new avenue.

Are there any other benefits that you might think of or possible benefits to the Academy in having females as midshipmen?

Commander Jenkins. Well, it cuts down on one of our social requirements. We have females already there. They don't have to bring them in from other places.

Mr. Dickinson. We are talking about 500 males; aren't we?

Commander Jenkins. I think I had hoped that one of the things that we would be able to do would be to raise our verbal on our scholastic aptitude test results. You usually find that a very articulate and intelligent female is the type who applies, or one who is from a family who has traveled extensively, because many of them are daughters of military people and perhaps the military people are looking for this sort of in *loco parentis* type of situation in an institution, and they feel they can get it more at a place like the Merchant Marine Academy or military institution.

In contrast, one of the females who did come has related she was transferred from an Ivy League school, and her problem was she couldn't study because of high hi-fi's, other things—problems with her roommate, she couldn't get any satisfaction from the administration to change her room, and her GPA really suffered as a result of that.

Parents are the most positive influence on the selection of colleges for youngsters. A lot are coming because of that.

Mr. **Fisher**. Thank you.

Mr. Hogan?

Mr. **Hogan**. Mr. Van Doren, do you concur in the statements of Commander Jenkins, in response to Mr. Dickinson's query about the pregnancy issue at the Merchant Marine Academy?

Mr. **Van Doren**. We have not considered that issue at all. Let us present something for the record at a later date.

Mr. **Daniel**. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **Hogan**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Daniel**. I think Mr. Hogan has raised very valid points here. The Commander used the word "suspended." To me that suggests discipline.

Mr. **Van Doren** I would agree.

Mr. **Daniel**. If it is discipline, for the female cadet being absent because of illness, you have to do the same thing as far as I am concerned, to the male cadet. This is the point I was trying to make. I don't think it is semantics I was talking about.

Mr. **Van Doren**. Maybe it is poor choice of words. Maybe it isn't suspension, but being relieved from duty for a temporary period until the physical condition has passed.

I see no reason, if the midshipman is married and arrangements are made for husband and child to live off campus, that she couldn't return.

Mr. **Hogan**. What if the midshipman is not married?

Mr. **Van Doren**. That poses a more difficult question. Then I don't know what approach the Academy would take. We would have to consider whether it is a situation where we want to discipline the cadet under these circumstances. We may find that for the discipline of the Academy it might be better to suspend that particular individual and perhaps not readmit her.

Mr. **Hogan**. Are there circumstances where the midshipman may live off campus.

Commander **Jenkins**. Obviously, during their sea year, or while they are doing intern training, they spend 2 weeks at an admiralty law firm in New York or San Francisco.

We have representatives that work out, law training representatives that work out of New Orleans, New York, and San Francisco; and they assign these students to ships or to maritime firms.

And those are the only times that they do live off campus.

Mr. **Hogan**. There is a suggestion here that if the midshipwoman became pregnant, that there would be a circumstance where she may be allowed to live off campus, according to counsel. Wouldn't that be setting up a different set of rules for men and women?

Commander JENKINS. No. They would have a setback.

Actually, if they miss part of the academics, they would be set back to the year prior to their regular year's class.

So it is not really setting up a different requirement. It is just that they are going to be set back.

Mr. HOGAN. In connection with the Naval curriculum at the Merchant Marine Academy, do the midshipmen study gunnery?

Commander JENKINS. Yes, gunnery is part of the naval orientation program at the Academy.

Mr. HOGAN. The women will be studying gunnery, too?

Commander JENKINS. Yes.

Mr. HOGAN. What is the purpose of that?

Commander JENKINS. Well, we are not making any distinction in the program. We are not changing or modifying the academic program at all.

It is only the physical program or athletic program that we are modifying.

Mr. HOGAN. If they are not going into combat, that is a little waste of time; isn't it?

Commander JENKINS. We do not know whether they are not going into combat. There is a possibility. If they graduate in 1978 or 1979, there is a possibility things will have changed.

Mr. HOGAN. At the present time, we know they are not going into combat.

Commander JENKINS. They are not going to graduate until 1978; so we are going with the assumption it is better to prepare them than not to prepare them.

Mr. VAN DOREN. I think you will find from the experience during World War II, that merchant ships were usually equipped with some sort of armament, and if we are going to train officers to run those ships——

Mr. HOGAN. So, in effect, then you are training women at the Merchant Marine Academy for combat?

Commander JENKINS. As much as we are training the males.

You will find, I have some pictures here taken during indoctrination. They did some of the same things that the males did, including lifting men on their backs.

Mr. HOGAN. I am not arguing the point. I just want to make sure we get it in the record.

What about the M-1; what is the purpose of training women in the use of the M-1?

Commander JENKINS. It is part of the military training.

Mr. HOGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that like in other witnesses, we are getting away from the real basic thing, and spending a lot of time on this pregnancy thing.

I don't know that this is as much of an issue as we are trying to make of it.

It seems to me if something like this should occur, do you suspect there would be some effort in the event the young lady was unmarried, to try and find out who got her in this condition and penalize him also, or put him under some type of suspension?

Why is the woman always the one who has to suffer and take the abuse of this type of thing?

Mr. VAN DOREN. I tend to agree with you. That is why I hesitated to answer the question.

It seems to be somewhat unfair perhaps to put out a regulation like this.

Mr. WILSON. We are talking about suspending or penalizing a woman in some way or finding fault with her.

It takes two to accomplish this thing, and it seems to me that we ought to be thinking of this thing in a broad sense and treat everyone in the same manner.

Mr. VAN DOREN. The Academy as a policy matter may decide that mothers should not go aboard merchant ships, and that the Academy would prefer to have its graduates going aboard ships to be either single or if married only male, but that would be a policy decision, rather than anything else.

Mr. WILSON. I was interested in that. We have no jurisdiction over the Merchant Marine Academy or the maritime administration, but I was interested in reading this law that applies on the appointments, and it may be that I am going to discuss it with the committee Chairman to see if he does not think that there should be a law change.

Apparently, you have no restrictions on men only until you come to the two from the Canal Zone. That does specifically say "sons". You are allowed two each year from the Canal Zone to be filled by qualified candidates nominated by the Government of the Canal Zone from among the sons of residents, and the sons of personnel of the United States Government of the Panama Canal residing in the Republic of Panama.

Then you get to American Samoa, Virgin Islands, Guam.

There is no restriction there, just as there is no restriction in the States and the Mainland as to sex—just that they are qualified candidates.

This seems like a strange thing that probably should be corrected, I would think.

Mr. VAN DOREN. I think the legislation has been introduced to correct that.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you.

I want to thank the two witnesses. You have given us some useful information. We are all proud of the Maritime Academy. They have a great record and have made a great contribution to our maritime affairs in this country. Personally, I share the views expressed by Mr. Daniel; that women have an opportunity to participate in this program, which is essentially noncombat.

We know from experience that it has worked out very well in some instances, in private industry, where women have been aboard ships; you referred to those things.

Very well. That will conclude our hearings, so far as the maritime witnesses are concerned.

The record is not closed. There are one or two that wanted to be heard who couldn't be heard, so we will keep it open for the time being.

[Whereupon, at 11:05 a.m., the subcommittee proceeded to further business.]

○